

SENATE

SATURDAY, January 15, 1927

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we are the continued recipients of Thy mercies. We recognize the hand that is guiding our affairs and ask for further wisdom in the great movements of the day. Direct our thoughts, influence our conduct, and be ever near and precious to us in the highest purposes of life. Hear and help; for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on the request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3804) granting the consent of Congress to W. D. Comer and Wesley Vandercook to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River between Longview, Wash., and Rainier, Oreg., with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15959) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 11616) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 15959) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE, WASHINGTON-OREGON

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3804) granting the consent of Congress to W. D. Comer and Wesley Vandercook to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River between Longview, Wash., and Rainier, Oreg., which was on page 4, line 25, to strike out "4" and insert the figure "3."

Mr. JONES of Washington. The House amendment simply makes a necessary change in the numbering of a section of the bill. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

LAND AT THE MARGIN OF ROCK CREEK AND POTOMAC PARKWAY

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I report back favorably from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to the bill (S. 5231) authorizing the sale of land at margin of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway for construction of a church and provision for proper ingress and egress to said church building, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I am sure it will not require any debate.

Mr. CURTIS. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the bill.

Mr. GLASS. I may state briefly that the bill received the unqualified sanction of the engineer commissioner, that a similar bill has been unanimously reported on the House side, and this bill is unanimously reported here.

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection to it.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "authorized," to strike out "and directed," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, for and in behalf of the United States of America be, and is hereby, authorized to convey the title of United States of America in and to the land and premises lying south of and adjacent to lot No. 25, in square 2510, in the District of Columbia, described as follows: Beginning at the southeast corner of said lot

No. 25; thence northwesterly along the south line of said lot No. 25 150 feet to the southwest corner of said lot; thence southwesterly on the projection of the east line of a public alley and at right angles to the said south line of lot No. 25 17 feet; thence southeasterly and parallel to said south line of lot 25, 150 feet to the west line of Florida Avenue; thence northeasterly on the west line of Florida Avenue 17 feet to the point of beginning, containing 2,550 square feet, more or less, upon the payment to the United States of America, in consideration thereof of a sum not less than the price paid for said land by the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission. And the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital is authorized and directed to permit the trustees of the Church of the Pilgrims (Inc.) to construct and utilize on the property acquired for the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway in square 2510 a driveway for proper access to and egress from the church, this driveway to be located and constructed in accordance with plans approved by the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital and to be maintained at the expense of said Church of the Pilgrims until such time as the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital may deem it advisable to make the same available for general use.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. GLASS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of New Market, in the State of Virginia, remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. 4821) to provide for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DENEEN presented petitions numerous signed by sundry citizens of Chicago and De Kalb, in the State of Illinois, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

THE NICARAGUAN AND MEXICAN SITUATION

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I have an important telegram from some of the most distinguished and representative citizens of Massachusetts, which I ask to have read at the desk, with the names, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. These petitioners are among the most prominent jurists, educators, and clergymen in the Nation.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the telegram in reference to the Turkish treaty?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is not. It relates to our Nicaragua-Mexico policy.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator will pardon me for asking the question, but a petition in reference to the Turkish treaty went into the RECORD the other day in open session and I did not want to have it occur again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chief Clerk will read the telegram, as requested.

The telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., January 14, 1927.

DAVID I. WALSH,
Washington, D. C.:

We look with growing apprehension upon the present policy of our Government in Nicaragua and Mexico. We oppose the use of armed forces in this settlement of disputes with the Latin-American Republics. Accordingly we urge the submission to adjudication of our legal dispute with Mexico and the withdrawal of those forces from Nicaragua not absolutely indispensable for the protection of American life and property.

George W. Anderson, judge, United States Circuit Court, Boston; Bishop William F. Anderson, Methodist Church; Roland W. Boyden, lawyer; George W. Coleman, president Babson Institute; Dr. L. O. Hartman, editor Zions Herald; Joseph Lee, Boston; Rabbi Harry Levi, Temple Israel; John F. Moors, Moors & Cabot, brokers; the Rev. Boynton Merrill, associate minister, Old South Church; James P. Munroe, president Munroe Felt Paper Co.; Dean Stephen Rushmore, Tufts Medical College; Moorfield Storey, past president American Bar Association; Francis B. Sayre, professor of law, Harvard University; the Rev. Dr. Harold E. B. Speight, minister, Kings Chapel; the Rev. Eugene R. Shipped, Second Church, Boston; Prof. Frank W. Taussig, economics department, Harvard; Thomas Wood, chairman American Friends Service Committee; Prof. Allyn A. Young, past president American Economic Association; the Rev. Dr. Ashley Day Leavitt, president Greater Boston Federation of Churches.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senate will bear with me just a moment, I want to comment briefly upon the telegram which the Senator from Massachusetts has read.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, the session is passing away very rapidly, and while I do not begrudge affording any reasonable opportunity for the discussion of matters like this, it does seem to me that we who have bills which we have experienced some difficulty in getting up for consideration should not have the time consumed to the extent which, of course, is involved in the discussion of a subject of this kind.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand. The Senator is perfectly in order; and if he objects, I am out of order. It is particularly proper that the Senator from Maryland, who has occupied no time whatever in the debate on any subject, should make the point of order.

Mr. BRUCE. If I have occupied a great deal of time, perhaps it was because of the infectious example which has been set me by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator does not want any further example. I suppose if he insists I shall not have an opportunity to make the statement at this time.

Mr. BRUCE. I am always happy to hear the Senator from Nebraska speak. I withdraw the objection.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator from Maryland to get the idea that I feel at all offended because he was insisting on the regular order. I will promise, however, to occupy the attention of the Senate but a moment.

The telegram which the Senator from Massachusetts had read, and particularly the signatures to it, would indicate that those men of education and standing, as they all are, have not read the showing which the Secretary of State made before the Foreign Relations Committee as published in the newspapers the day after he was there. I have before me the Washington Post of Thursday, January 13, the day after the Secretary of State appeared, and there is a whole page devoted to what the Secretary of State showed before the Foreign Relations Committee to be the activities of the Bolsheviks and the communists all over the country for the destruction of our Government, our "imperialistic" Government as they term it. The facts which he disclosed to the committee and to the country with reference to the activities of the Bolsheviks and the communists who are undermining our great Government show how hard the Department of State has been working to run down and to catch those enemies of a free Government.

I can imagine how the Secretary of State, with trembling hand and trembling voice, laid before the Foreign Relations Committee the showing which was published in the Washington Post, clearly indicating that he had not run anybody down yet and has not found anybody, but he has some evidence of a Bolshevik in Moscow, one in Mexico, some over in Canada, and some in New York; that they are diligently hunting for them and are hoping to get them.

When I read it I was reminded of a poem which was written by James Whitcomb Riley, and I thought he had had a foresight of what was going to happen and had written a sort of prophetic poem about it. I want the Senate to listen to the reading of what is suggested by one of Riley's verses and which shows how diligently the Secretary of State has searched and hunted for these Bolsheviks:

One't they was a Bolshevik,
Who wouldn't say his prayers—
So Kellogg sent him off to bed,
Away up stairs,
An' Kellogg heerd him holler, an'
Coolidge heerd him bawl,
But when they turn't the klvvers
Down, he wasn't there at all!
They seeked him down in Mexico,
They cussed him in the press;
They seeked him 'round the Capitol,
An' ever'wheres, I guess;
But all they ever found of him was
Whiskers, hair, and clout—
An' the Bolsheviks 'll get you
Ef you
Don't
Watch
Out!

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, one of the subjects which Congress will be called upon to legislate is that of agricultural relief. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by C. G. Williams, of the Ohio Experiment

Station, on the general subject of agricultural legislation. The article appears in The Ohio Farmer, a leading agricultural farm journal, under the date of January 1, 1927.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS ON AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION—OUR FIELD CROPS MAN GIVES HIS VIEWS ON PRESENT FARM RELIEF AGITATION

I have recently heard some addresses on the McNary-Haugen bill and I wish Mr. Williams would answer some questions for me if he will. Has not England done with reference to rubber, and Brazil with reference to coffee just what the McNary-Haugen bill proposes to do for our basic farm products, and if so, why should we not be smart enough to take care of ourselves; in other words, be on our own side? If there is no better way of taking care of our surplus why should not all agricultural sections and all organizations get back of the McNary-Haugen bill instead of splitting up our forces and part supporting the debenture bounty plan? Finally, how is agriculture benefited by our present tariff on manufactured products? (Subscriber, Portage County, Ohio.)

The writer does not profess to be an expert in agricultural economics, but like most farmer-minded men he has quite naturally given some attention to agricultural surpluses. Taking up our correspondent's questions:

My understanding of what England has done with reference to rubber, and Brazil to coffee is to limit production or exports, or both, and in this way raise the price of these commodities to foreign consumers. And they have succeeded in doing this for a time.

If I understand McNary-Haugenism it will do the reverse of this, namely, tend to increase production, and most certainly lower price of food to foreign consumers. It will be difficult to commend either of these practices as economically sound.

If the United States wanted to follow England and her dependencies, it might be more to the point to consider the action recently taken in Egypt. On December 8, 1926, the Egyptian Chamber of Deputies passed a law "limiting the cotton acreage for three years—1927-28-29—to a third of the present acreage on every plantation."

Of course, the United States is not ready for legislation of this sort. In large sections of our country we even object to the Federal Department of Agriculture reporting "the intentions to plant," thinking we shall be freer, I suspect, by not knowing the truth. There is just one little gleam of hope in the fact that portions of our country paid some attention to the potato probabilities last spring. In time we may learn to take care of ourselves.

CONGRESS CAN'T SAVE THE FARMER

There is a feeling abroad—I might almost say a mania—that our agricultural troubles are going to be solved by an act of Congress. What agriculture needs, in my judgment, is not so much legislation as organization. Given an agriculture as thoroughly organized and working together as are other industrial groups, and our problems would speedily be solved.

By common consent our main troubles at the present time are surpluses. Who can put a stop to these surpluses? Organized farmers. How can they put a stop to surpluses? By reducing the acreage of crops planted and by cutting two to four hours off the average working day—spending a little more time at grange and farm bureau meetings.

Take the cotton situation at the present time. What has happened to the cotton acreage? In 1921-22 our cotton acreage averaged 32,000,000 acres in round numbers. In 1925-26 it averaged 47,000,000 acres. An increase of more than 46 per cent, and yet some would tell us that the remedy for the cotton situation is to raise the price of cotton by legislation!

I suppose that no McNary-Haugenite would accuse Wallace's Farmer of agricultural heresy. In the number for October 8, 1926, the editor says: "The corn and hog farmers of the Middle West would get their share of the national income if they would agree to cut the corn acreage in 1927 to a point 15 per cent below that of the present year, and at the same time cut their hogs to fit the corn," which he estimates to be one sow to each 5 acres.

It will not be a simple thing to reduce our corn acreage 15 per cent and our cotton acreage 20 to 30 per cent, but if this will bring the prosperity which our editor believes—and I am inclined to agree with him—it might be as well for our agricultural leaders to center their efforts upon such reduction of acreages rather than upon attempts to handle surpluses at profitable prices to the farmer and thereby encourage still greater surpluses. It may be easier to reduce acreages than to repeal economic laws.

As to better plans for taking care of surpluses, I think I have already indicated a better plan, namely, to take steps not to produce them. On the average a reduced acreage will, of course, mean reduced production, but there will be exceptional seasons when this will not hold. When these exceptions occur ways must be found by the producer to handle his surpluses, such as seeking and finding new markets; new uses for these products; holding portions for lean years which are certain to come; more orderly marketing (our warehousing facilities make this

entirely feasible); severe grading and culling; marketing only very high-grade products.

But I expect our correspondent is thinking of the debenture bounty plan. Many of the objections to the McNary-Haugen plan apply to this also as the reader will readily see. However, if public sentiment has been worked up to a point that it seems that some legislation of this sort must be had—something that will have the appearance at least of taking care of the farmer, it would seem that it should take the form of debentures on exports. If properly safeguarded against surpluses, this method will do the less harm in my judgment, and if it falls to accomplish all that is hoped for, it can be dropped without serious disturbance. In other words, it is a very simple proposition, easily put into effect and as easily discontinued.

There is one thing we may as well take into account now as later. Legislation of either sort is not going to stop with corn, hogs, cotton, wheat, and tobacco. Does anyone think that our dairymen, our orchardists, our potato growers, our truck farmers, etc.—in other words, our diversified farmers—are going to penalize themselves permanently for the benefit of our one-crop farmers? We may as well look matters squarely in the face. How long does the reader suppose legislation of this sort is likely to stand if it really accomplishes its purpose? The voting population of the United States is on the other side. Consumers of these products vastly outnumber the producers. Why attempt to do by antagonistic legislation what organized farmers can do for themselves by reducing production?

ON THE TARIFF QUESTION

Now, just a word about the tariff:

I do not suppose that there is any question but that most of our manufacturing industries of this country have been made possible by the protection offered by a tariff. We have a recent example of how this has operated in the case of some of the new dyeing industries started in this country during the war. There is little question but that they would have been speedily wiped out of existence by German competition but for tariff protection.

This has, of course, been true of many lines. I would not undertake to say that all of the present tariff rates are needed to keep our industries in successful operation. Without question there has been too much logrolling, too much writing of one's own tariff schedules in the recent past. Certain tariffs might very likely be reduced, but the farmer will be an early sufferer from any wholesale repeal of the tariff and consequent disturbance of our manufacturing industries.

These industries have brought the farmers' former European market to his immediate door in many instances, and what is needed at the present time more than anything else is to extend these industries into one crop agricultural territory.

Our great concern is our home market, and our hope lies in extending it and adjusting our production to it.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WALSH of Montana obtained the floor.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Frazier	La Follette	Sackett
Bayard	George	Lenroot	Schall
Bingham	Gerry	McKellar	Sheppard
Blaine	Gillett	McLean	Shipstead
Borah	Glass	McMaster	Shortridge
Bratton	Goff	McNary	Smith
Broussard	Gooding	Mayfield	Smoot
Bruce	Gould	Means	Steck
Cameron	Greene	Metcalf	Stephens
Capper	Hale	Moses	Stewart
Caraway	Harris	Neely	Swanson
Connors	Harrison	Norbeck	Trammell
Curtis	Hawes	Norris	Tyson
Dale	Heflin	Nye	Wadsworth
Denneen	Howell	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Dill	Johnson	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Warren
Ernst	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Watson
Ferris	Kendrick	Pittman	Wheeler
Fess	Keyes	Ransdell	Willis
Fletcher	King	Robinson, Ark.	

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS] is absent on account of illness in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE MEXICAN SITUATION

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] on yesterday expressed most commendable concern regarding the state of our relations with the Republic of Mexico. I myself have not shared in the apprehension which has prevailed concerning any serious troubles culminating in armed conflict with our neighbor on the south, and

I sincerely trust the present differences may in some amicable way be adjusted.

Perhaps, without making the direct assertion, it might easily be inferred from the remarks of the Senator from Alabama that he desired to convey the impression that the Catholic Church was engaged in an effort to foment a war with Mexico. The same intimation has come to me from other sources. I feel very confident, indeed, that the Senator has listened to information of an altogether unreliable character and has indulged in an entirely unwarranted inference from the facts at his command. For instance, in the course of his address he said:

On August 5, 1926, the Knights of Columbus, in annual supreme convention, meeting at Philadelphia, among other things done there on that occasion, the New York Times tell us, raised \$1,000,000 to help carry on a propaganda to bring about war with Mexico.

I have sent for the copy of the New York Times containing the declaration referred to, and I ask that it may be incorporated in the RECORD. It concludes as follows:

Therefore, as a pledge of our concern for our fellow Knights of Columbus of Mexico, and of our determination to pursue relentlessly our campaign for the eradication of these evils at our own doorsteps, fomented and approved by the official action of our State Department, we hereby authorize our supreme board of directors to assess our membership to the extent of \$1,000,000 for a campaign of education, to the end that the politics of Soviet Russia shall be eliminated from the philosophy of American life and the ideals of liberty of conscience and democratic freedom may extend to our afflicted fellow human beings beyond the Rio Grande.

To this end we pledge the support and cooperation of 800,000 men who love God, who respect lawful authority, and who, in the discharge of their duty, fear not the force of evil, either on earth or from hell.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the declaration will be printed in the RECORD.

The declaration referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times, August 6, 1926]

TEXT OF THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS DECLARATION

The declaration of the Knights of Columbus was as follows:

"The Knights of Columbus in annual supreme convention assembled, mindful of the historic soil of Philadelphia upon which we are privileged to stand, where 150 years ago were enunciated the principles so dear to the hearts of the American people of the philosophy of our Government, recognizing there were certain inalienable rights with which mankind was endowed by his Creator, namely, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and having viewed with deliberation and care the present political situation in the neighboring Government of Mexico, hereby solemnly aver that we would be neglectful of our duty if we did not register an unqualified protest against the policy of President Calles upon his recent despotic use of the armed forces of his military régime in oppressing the vast majority of the people of Mexico, who are struggling for the right to worship God according to their dictates of their conscience.

"We call the attention of the American Government to remind it that the representatives of Calles have insulted and degraded and expelled American citizens, men and women, under circumstances that are abhorrent to our conception of constitutional government. The fundamental rights guaranteed by our Constitution so dear to the hearts of Americans are unknown to the despotic power that is dominating Mexico, or to a so-called constitution that was forced upon the Mexican people at the point of the gun.

"We warn our fellow American citizens that they can not endure at their very doorstep, with impunity, the Russianizing of Mexico. The soviet philosophy controls the military powers of Mexico. The family to them is a myth and marriage a degradation. They have robbed it of its sanctity. Their conception of God is contempt for all religions.

"Ministers of all religions are denied the right to exercise their sacred functions; professions and vocations are prohibited; the right to take sacred vows for the service of God is denied; freedom of conscience is illegal; freedom of the press, freedom of petition, freedom of speech and lawful assemblage to present grievances of the people are denied and forbidden; freedom of education is repudiated and abolished; individual liberty is impossible; intolerance is defied; confiscation and spoliation of property are justified; constitutional liberty and orderly government are unknown; liberty, justice, and right have been assassinated by the red rulers of Mexico; communism in principle, precept, and practice is made the order of the day.

"While on the other hand, as enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is the ideal and practice; justice is established; domestic peace and tranquillity are assured; promotion of the general welfare is encouraged and safeguarded; the blessings of liberty are maintained and freedom of conscience, right of petition, free speech, free press are guaranteed.

"And all this system in Mexico has been created under American auspices, sustained by American executive authority, which, in the first place, while refusing to recognize Lenin and Trotsky, have by Executive order of recognition, accepted Calles and Obregon, who are the enthusiastic supporters of the Bolshevik concept of government.

"We further point to the significance of the patronage bestowed upon these military despots by the continuance of such recognition, and particularly by the discriminating favoritism shown to Calles by the continuance of the embargo, which makes the Calles ascendancy possible.

"We call upon the President and the State Department to put an end to this ignominious contempt which has been shown by Calles for Americans' appeal and to resolutely demand protection for American citizens and that they be treated with the same consideration and respect which is shown to Mexican citizens in this country.

"On occasions less acute than this, and where the circumstances were more remote from American contacts and far removed from our borders, geographically and otherwise, the American Government has expressed its sympathy for the struggle of oppressed people to realize their ideal of liberty, and the stories of Cuba, Ireland, Kishinev, and Hungary, and other similar historical incidents, testify to the warm sympathy of the American people with the downtrodden and oppressed of any nation to throw off the yoke of despotism.

"The period of 'watchful waiting' or any other such procedure is over. We, as American citizens, demand of our Government that this action be taken forthwith. Although our Government has for years emphatically refused to recognize the soviet régime of Russia, it has continued to countenance, aid, and comfort the Bolshevik forces of Carranza, Obregon, and Calles.

"We particularly call upon the American Federation of Labor and its affiliated organizations to heed this appeal to cooperate with us to safeguard not only American rights, but the hard-won victories of labor itself to protect it from servile submission to destructive powers of a militaristic and communistic form of government.

"Labor in this country is free and devoid of military coercion, and should ever remain so, and the situation for a free people desiring to work out their salvation as a labor organization is impossible under the present system in Mexico.

"As to the Knights of Columbus in Mexico, we extend to our brethren our sincere sympathy and fraternal concern. We bid they not to be downcast or dismayed. The ideals of our order, in its duty to all lawful authority that is not essentially immoral, are well known, and the records of our accomplishments are written in the archives of the War and Navy Departments and in the brave sons and younger brothers of our members who went across the sea 'to make the world safe for democracy.'

"Therefore, as a pledge of our concern for our fellow Knights of Columbus of Mexico, and of our determination to pursue relentlessly our campaign for the eradication of these evils at our own doorsteps, fomented and approved by the official action of our State Department, we hereby authorize our supreme board of directors to assess our membership to the extent of \$1,000,000 for a campaign of education, to the end that the politics of Soviet Russia shall be eliminated from the philosophy of American life and the ideals of liberty of conscience and democratic freedom may extend to our afflicted fellow human beings beyond the Rio Grande.

"To this end we pledge the support and cooperation of 800,000 men who love God, who respect lawful authority, and who, in the discharge of their duty, fear not the force of evil, either on earth or from hell."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. On the 12th day of last December the bishops of the church referred to in the United States addressed the laity a pastoral in which they set forth their position with respect to the troubles with Mexico, and included therein a paragraph in relation to the charge of intervention by armed forces. I ask that the pastoral letter be printed in the Record and that the paragraph to which I have referred be read by the Secretary from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

THIS IS NO APPEAL FOR POLITICAL INTERVENTION OR ACTION OF ANY SORT

What, therefore, we have written is no call on the faithful here or elsewhere to purely human action. It is no interposition of our influence either as bishops or as citizens to reach those who possess political power anywhere on earth, and least of all in our own country, to the end that they should intervene with armed force in the internal affairs of Mexico for the protection of the church. Our duty is done when, by telling the story, defending the truth, and emphasizing the principles, we sound a warning to Christian civilization that its foundations are again being attacked and undermined. For the rest, God will bring His will to pass in His own good time and in His own good way. Mexico will be saved for her mission whatever it may be. That this mission is now to give a great example of Christian patience and to demonstrate the force of faith undaunted, we may well believe. For the future we may take confidence from the examples of other

nations that went through the same fiery furnace of persecution and emerged triumphantly prepared for great things. The Mexican nation once proved its inherent worth by its rapid advancement in Christian civilization. For the days of De Gante and Zumarraga, Las Casas and Motolinia, as well as those of Junipero Serra, who carried the work of the missionaries into what is now our own land, Mexico has no need to offer apology.

The pastoral letter is as follows:

PASTORAL LETTER OF THE CATHOLIC EPISCOPATE OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN MEXICO

The cardinals, archbishops, and bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States of America to the clergy and faithful: peace and benediction in our Lord Jesus Christ, Teacher of the truth that makes us free.

Sympathy to those who suffer for conscience' sake has never been refused by the great heart of the American people. They almost instinctively sense all oppression to be a destroyer of unity at home, as well as an abundant source of the misunderstandings and hatreds that divide nations and peoples and injure the cause of international amity and world peace. If, then, we, as American bishops, had no other reason for issuing this pastoral than to show our deep sympathy with the suffering people of Mexico in the persecution now raging against religion in that country, it would be justified; but there are other reasons, carrying even greater weight and urgency, that make of this act a duty. They are found in the fact that Mexico is our neighbor—with all the power that propinquity gives to the force of good or evil example—a republic which it was intended should be modeled on lines similar to ours, and a nation with a Christian population whose devotion to the Catholic Church makes a special call upon the charity of the faithful everywhere but more especially upon those of the United States.

Even stronger reasons for the issuing of this pastoral arise out of the higher considerations of duty to those principles upon which all just government must be founded, principles which guard rights conferred upon man, not by states but by God himself. None, much less bishops of the church that holds the spiritual allegiance of almost the entire Mexican population, can be indifferent when these vital principles are attacked as boldly and as cruelly as is being done in Mexico to-day. This duty of defense and protest, first and most properly, has been recognized by the bishops of Mexico themselves in admirably worded petitions against oppression, as well as in timely, edifying, and intimate letters to their flocks. Their action may well be seconded by us, their brothers, separated by national frontiers but nevertheless bound to them in the bonds of a common faith, as well as by ties of fraternal charity made stronger in mutual understanding, esteem, and friendship.

WE SPEAK IN THE INTERESTS OF BOTH CHURCH AND STATE

All the more do we feel an obligation to speak boldly and publicly on the religious persecution raging in Mexico, because the common father of Christendom, Pius XI, vicar of Jesus Christ, has urged the faithful of the whole world to unite with him in sympathy and prayer to God for the afflicted church. He thus manifests at once his deep sorrow over her trials and his keen perception of the danger that this persecution threatens to "the peace of Christ in the kingdom of Christ" everywhere. He who has made it plain that his dearest wish, as well as the supreme motive of all his official actions, is nothing less than the reign of the Prince of Peace over all hearts, and who offers a sick and disturbed world the remedy of the Master's teaching and the Master's love, has, by his timely appeal, recognized its gravity and the threat it carries to religion the world over.

Yet another and still stronger motive urges us to speak. It is that the present conflict, as one part of a war against religion in Mexico which had its inception almost a century ago, to a greater degree than any preceding it comes from an attempt at nothing less than the destruction of the divine constitution of the church by reducing her to the status of a state-controlled schismatical body, without the right to form, train, and educate her own clergy, to have a sufficient number of them for the care of souls, to find means for her support, to develop works in accord with her mission of charity and enlightenment, and to apply the teachings of the gospel to the formation of a public conscience. Sad experience, as well as right reason, tells us what would follow the success of such an attempt, and what it would mean to church as well as to state.

The Mexican church, thus controlled and bound, as the civil power seeks to control and bind her, nominally might be separated, but really would be a department of the political machinery of the state. Her dignities and offices would be the perquisites of politicians; her voice the changing voice of political action. She would be despised by her faithful and justly mocked by her enemies. Her bond of unity with the church universal would first be weakened and then snapped asunder. The Mexican Government asks the church to accept a slavery that could mean nothing to-day but an infection caught from evil surroundings, and to-morrow a decline into mortal sickness inevitably ending with her passing from the life of the Mexican people.

WE SPEAK AS AMERICANS AS WELL AS CATHOLICS

To the state would come no less evil results. With the check of religious influence gone, history for her also would be repeated. She would forget her dreams of democracy and actually become a despotism. Corruption would increase with power to confer ecclesiastical emoluments upon the unworthy. She would merit and receive the hatred of just men at home and the contempt of just men abroad. A "holy synod," doing the unholy work of despotism, would gradually absorb her strength and seize her power as a most convenient machinery of government. Whatever of good is in her ideals would be shattered on one of the oldest rocks that lie hidden in the waters of political life.

The question that we are considering then is vital both to the church and to the state. However blind may be the advocates of such plans in government to their evils, the Mexican church prefers, if she must, to perish defending her divine constitution and the religious rights of her people rather than to accept the alternative of a slavery that would mean the disgrace of faithlessness as well as ultimate ruin to her spiritual mission. In fact, the church in Mexico has no choice; for merely to continue her public religious functions under these oppressive and unjust conditions would be an open declaration that she had submitted to them, and thus had taken a first step toward divorcing herself from the unity of the church universal.

If, then, because of the fact that the persecution in Mexico is directed against all the principles of religion, we should speak as the servants of God; if, because it is unloosed particularly against the religion of the majority of the people of Mexico, we should speak as Catholics, there are grave reasons, too, why we have a duty to speak as Americans attached to the institutions of our country and loving them for the benefits they have conferred upon us all. The Government of Mexico has, indeed, by its actions in our very midst, made it necessary that we should no longer guard silence, for it has carried its war on religion beyond its own boundaries through organized propaganda in many countries, but especially in our own.

WE CONSIDER THE MEXICAN GOVERNMENT IN THE LIGHT OF AMERICAN AND CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES

Through its diplomatic and consular agents in the United States that Government appeals to the American people to justify its actions. In consequence we have before us the extraordinary spectacle of a foreign government not only filling our country with propaganda in favor of its own internal plans and policies but even attempting to justify and defend, in our Nation, laws and conduct at variance with fundamentals set down in imperishable documents by the fathers of this Republic. Misinterpreting our good-natured tolerance for a neighbor still disturbed by consequences of many military upheavals, the Government of Mexico has thus presumed to appeal to our fellow citizens for approval. This actually amounts to the submission of its case for judgment to a court beyond its own boundaries; pleading not before its own citizens, who, according to its constitution, form the only court competent to pass upon it, but before strangers who claim no jurisdiction over their neighbor's political affairs, and whose only interest in them is a desire for the well-being of the people of Mexico and their own peace in amicable mutual relations. The Government of Mexico can not, therefore, object, under such circumstances, if the case it has thus presented for judgment be considered in the light of American principles as embodied in our fundamental laws, and in the light of Christian principles, since it appeals for the sympathy of Christians; nor, since it claims great zeal for the advancement of education, if the statements it has presented in support of its pleading be submitted to the test of history. These are the things we purpose to do, so that not only will our own citizens be fully informed of the interests at stake but the Mexican people will not be without benefit of advocate before the court to which their rulers have actually but mistakenly appealed.

PART I

LIBERTY IN THE LIGHT OF THE AMERICAN AND MEXICAN CONSTITUTIONS

The Government of Mexico bases its case upon repeated assurances that it is merely enforcing the constitution and fundamental laws of the Mexican Nation. It will not be out of place then to compare this constitution and these laws with our own, at least in so far as they affect the rights of conscience. In no better way can the points at issue be made clear.

The difference between the conception of civil and religious freedom upheld by the American Constitution and that of the makers and defenders of the present constitution of Mexico will be best understood by contrasting the two instruments. This will show that only by slurring over or concealing the actual facts of the case can the Mexican Government hope to secure the sympathy of thoughtful and unbiased Americans, whose ideas of civic justice and right are radically different from those expressed in Mexican law. The contrast will prove this without argument. Certainly there is no basis for argument, unless it be in an attempt not to reconcile our policies with those of the Mexican Government but to prove that ours are wrong. In fact, what the Government of Mexico actually asks us to do, in begging our sympathy and approval, is nothing less than to condemn

the work of the fathers of this Republic, register dissatisfaction with the Constitution they gave us, and demand its overthrow, for no American can accept the Mexican theory of government as being in accord with fundamental justice without repudiating his own traditions and ideals. The very audacity and boldness of the Mexican Government in thus appealing to us for sympathy in favor of laws and conduct at variance with our most cherished political convictions has been, perhaps, the chief reason why the fact of their opposition to these convictions has been overlooked. Possibly it is for the same reason that some Christian people everywhere have overlooked also the fact that the present Government of Mexico is making war on one of the essentials of Christianity, namely, liberty of conscience, on which Leo XIII clearly set forth the Christian position. "Another liberty," he writes, "is widely advocated, namely, liberty of conscience. If by this is meant that everyone may, as he chooses, worship God or not, it is sufficiently refuted by the arguments already adduced. But it may also be taken to mean that every man in the state may follow the will of God, and, from a consciousness of duty and free from every obstacle, obey His commands. This, indeed, is true liberty, a liberty worthy of the sons of God, which nobly maintains the dignity of man, and is stronger than all violence or wrong—a liberty which the church has always desired and held most dear. This is the kind of liberty the apostles claimed for themselves with intrepid constancy, which the apologists of Christianity confirmed by their writings, and which the martyrs in vast numbers consecrated by their blood. And deservedly so, for this Christian liberty bears witness to the absolute and most just dominion of God over man, and to the chief and supreme duty of man toward God. It has nothing in common with a seditious and rebellious mind; and in no little derogates from obedience to public authority, for the right to command and to require obedience exists only so far as it is in accordance with the authority of God, and is within the measures that He has laid down. But when anything is commanded which is plainly at variance with the will of God there is a wide departure from this divinely constituted order, and at the same time a direct conflict with divine authority; therefore, it is right not to obey." (Encyclical "Libertas Praestantissimum," June 20, 1888.)

THE DIVINE MISSION OF THE CHURCH

In a thousand other passages this illustrious pontiff, his predecessors and successors, have set forth Catholic teaching on this and kindred topics with which we are now concerned. The doctrines of the church are not secrets. With her Master she can say, "In secret I have spoken nothing." (John xviii, 20.) According to that teaching, it is God's will, contained in both His natural and positive law, which is the first law of life, public and private. To discover that will through the searching process of a sincere and enlightened conscience, using the means which God has furnished, and then to follow its lead, is every man's native right and duty. "This is my beloved son; hear ye Him" (Matthew xvii, 5) is the burden of the message of God to the human race. Therefore do we cling to Christ as "the way, the truth, and the life." (John xiv, 6.) He in turn charges His apostles and their successors with the task of continuing His mission of teaching and of sanctifying the coming generations. "He that heareth you heareth me and he that despiseth you despiseth me." (Luke x, 16.) To them consequently the Catholic looks as to his authoritative guides in the pathway that leads to eternity. To these "dispensers of the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. iv, 1) the Catholic owes conscientious obedience in such matters that have been confided to their care by the chief shepherd of our souls, who is Christ. Only by arbitrary interference outside its own independent proper sphere of action can the state obstruct the due fulfillment of the pastoral ministry; and this the Mexican Government seeks to do, denying in effect the final authority of the will of God plainly expressed to man for his spiritual guidance, and by a bold act of arbitrary power invading its rights in favor of the state.

Passing from the consideration of the conception of civil and religious liberty in constitutions to the constitutions themselves, we are met with the plea of the Mexican Government that it is doing no more than enforcing its own.

Here, however, at the outset, it is confronted with two important facts: First, that though the antireligious laws of the country date from 1857 (previous to this date the state endeavored to make the bishops and priests political appointees, and to legislate in church affairs), yet no government till now has ever attempted to give them full effect; and, second, that though these laws were reaffirmed and made more drastic in the constitution of 1917, yet President Carranza himself suggested changing the clauses affecting religion (Diario Oficial, November 21, 1918. Bill to modify art. 3; Diario Oficial, December 17, 1918. Bill to modify paragraphs VII, VIII, and XVI of art. 130), and President Obregon never attempted to enforce all of them during the four years of his administration. These two facts show that it was tacitly recognized how far removed such laws were from justice and from the approval of the Mexican people. The appeal to the constitution, however, does take our eyes off persons and, for the moment, directs attention to the written instrument by which such persons seek to justify their acts. It is in order, therefore, to inquire into the nature and purpose of a constitution.

THE PURPOSE OF A CONSTITUTION

A written constitution is an instrument which enumerates and defines the rights and duties of government, distributes its powers, prescribes the manner of their exercise, and limits them to the end that the liberties of the citizens may be preserved. Since the purpose of government is to protect human rights, not to destroy them, it follows that the charter by which a government operates can not contain a grant of unlimited power; for the exercise of such power would be tyranny, inasmuch as it would tend to destroy rights which both the natural and the positive laws of God place beyond the jurisdiction of men. Hence, in the commonly accepted American doctrine, a constitution vests the government with such rights and powers as are necessary for the proper exercise of its just functions, and at the same time forbids it to encroach upon rights of a higher order which come to men not from the people, nor from the state, nor from any aggregation of states, but from the Creator of both men and states, Almighty God. This conception is wholly in keeping with the teaching of the Catholic Church.

There can be no possible doubt, then, that protection of the natural and inalienable rights of the individual is essential to the very notion of a constitution. Unlimited power would need no constitution, for a constitution is a guaranty of liberty, not an engine of tyranny. No such document, whatever its origin, can win respect or exact obedience when it destroys these rights or enacts statutes which make their exercise morally impossible, for such an instrument is not to accord with that right reason which vindicates man's natural rights. "Human law is law only by virtue of its accordance with right reason," says St. Thomas Aquinas, "and thus it is manifest that it flows from the eternal law. And in so far as it deviates from right reason it is called an unjust law; in such case it is no law at all, but rather a species of violence." (Summa, 1a, 11ae, Q. xciii, art. 3.)

MAN HAS INALIENABLE RIGHTS

This, indeed, is the force of the Declaration of Independence, a document rightly regarded by all Americans as the corner stone of this Government. With the signers, we hold certain truths "to be self-evident." We agree that "all men," Mexicans included, "are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men Plainly, then, these rights are held by every man, not by the tolerance or grant of any state, but by the immutable decree of Almighty God. It is not within the authority of any government to destroy or to hamper them. On the contrary, it is the solemn duty of the government "to secure" them; and the government which attacks them must be repudiated by all right-minded men. In the words of St. Thomas its action is not law "but rather a species of violence." On this teaching St. Thomas and the Declaration of Independence are in complete accord.

Now, while it is not easy, as the Supreme Court has recently declared, to enumerate all the rights which are comprehended under the primal right "to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," it is certain, as the same court has held, in a very important case (*Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 U. S. 390), that among them is the right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of conscience. Let it be further observed that the constant and unvarying interpretation of the Federal Constitution by the courts bears out our contention that the Government exists to protect the citizen in the exercise of his natural and inalienable rights, and that it may enact no law which destroys them.

THE STATE MUST PROTECT THESE RIGHTS

Constantly, too, has the Catholic Church upheld this conception of government under whatever form it may be exercised. Unlimited power over the liberty of the citizen is not Christian teaching. It is not the teaching of the fathers of this Republic. It is not the doctrine of our courts, which has again and again rejected it. To frame a constitution or to enact legislation which makes impossible man's enjoyment of his natural heritage of liberty is not within the legitimate power of any civil government, no matter how constituted.

For this heritage descends to him by the natural law which "is coeval with mankind" and, since it "is dictated by God Himself," as Blackstone writes in his celebrated Commentaries (Commentaries, Intro., sec. 2), "it is of course superior in obligation to any other. . . . No human laws are of any validity if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original." The legislator, opposing the dictates of this law, can not prescribe a course which is reasonable, or which is profitable to the community, and since his act in no way reflects the wisdom of the natural law, which is the wisdom of the Eternal Lawgiver, it is not law, and can impose no obligations upon any citizen. It merits respect from no just man, and least of all from Americans whose theory of government it outrages. Thus it is seen that the wisdom of Christian teaching has not failed to impress itself on the minds of distinguished men whose studies and writings on law have won for them deserved eminence before their fellows. In this con-

nection we recall words written in our Pastoral of 1919: "The end for which the state exists, and for which authority is given it, determines the limit of its powers. It must respect and protect the divinely established rights of the individual and the family. It must safeguard the liberty of all, so that none shall encroach upon the rights of others. But it may not rightfully hinder the citizen in the discharge of his conscientious obligations, and much less in the performance of duties he owes to God."

MAN CAN NOT SUSPEND GOD-GIVEN RIGHTS

These words are in accord with both the natural and the positive laws of God. They are in accord with the recognition of these laws by the founders of our Republic. To give practical effect to them the first amendment to the Constitution, forbidding Congress to prohibit the free exercise of religion, was adopted, and by degrees a similar prohibition was inserted into the constitution or bills of rights of the several States. These guaranties are more than part of the Federal Constitution and of the constitutions of the respective States. They are part of the constitution of the rights of free men. The church has never been in disaccord with them, for, while she has been careful always to safeguard peace and oppose discord by protecting legitimate authority, she has not failed to point out to the civil authority its duties to the people as well as its responsibilities to God. Through her theologians, among whom may be cited St. Thomas Aquinas, Blessed Robert Bellarmine and Suarez, she has indicated the rights of the people with which no state and no ruler may interfere, insisted that they are beyond and above the statutes made by kings and senates, because deriving their sanction, not from the will and power of earthly authority but from the authority of God and the dignity of man as an intelligent being.

It is not possible to hold that modern progress has antiquated or set aside this truth of the divine source of all authority, for it is not within man's power to destroy that which is true, nor yet within his power to change that which is unchangeable. Truth is fixed and immutable. It is possible to discover new beauty in truth so that it shines brighter to the eyes of man, but its light can not be extinguished. Light does not fight light but dissolves into it according to the universal law of its essential unity. Nor is it possible to hold that, under exceptional circumstances, a nation may acquire or take the right to set aside the principles upon which just government is builded and thus interfere with the fundamental rights of conscience for the supposed good of the state. The state can not benefit by wrong, and rights given by God are beyond the legitimate power of man to suspend or to cancel.

THE INVIOLENT SANCTUARY OF THE SOUL

The individual citizen does not then resign to society all the rights that he possesses as a free man, as some would have it appear, receiving back only a portion of them as a gift from the state, while nominally retaining in himself a sovereignty that actually is exercised by those who rule in his name. This doctrine, well known to the fathers of the Republic, was nevertheless rejected by them. The Government of Mexico, by insisting on obedience to a constitution made without reference to justice by a handful of military rulers, contrary to human rights and never submitted to the people for ratification, insists that the individual citizen has no rights that his Government is bound to respect; that there are no limits to the powers of Government. No doctrine could be more certain than that to sweep out of existence the sturdy self-reliance of a people, to sow discord within and enmity without. The power of the state, coming from God, may be bestowed by the people, but when thus bestowed it does not and can not include what is not within the competency of the state to accept. Had God ordained the rule of the state over the soul and conscience, He would have given the state the means to direct conscience and control the operations of the soul, since He gives means to the end.

The sanctuary of the soul and of conscience the state can not invade. It is precisely this that the Government of Mexico seeks to do, and then to justify, before a people whose national ideals are in direct contradiction to the evil spirit of despotism and tyranny that actuates the laws and the rulers now making of Mexico a shocking example of wrong to the whole civilized world. It is plain then that there was no exaggeration in the language of Pope Pius XI when he characterized these laws as "diabolical."

AMERICAN RECOGNITION OF THE RIGHTS AND UTILITY OF RELIGION

Passing now from consideration of the constitutions themselves, we may, with better informed minds, contrast the laws founded upon them by Mexico and by our own Republic.

American laws recognize the right of the citizen to worship God "according to the dictates of his conscience," and, in order that this freedom may be assured him, religious societies are recognized as corporate legal entities having power to possess what property they need to carry out their mission. Furthermore, that mission is recognized as being, not only religious in root and trunk, but as bearing flowers and fruit in works of education and social welfare. Religious

societies may, therefore, own land and upon it erect such buildings as are necessary for their purposes. They may establish, own, and direct schools, colleges, universities, asylums, hospitals, and other institutions of education and social welfare. They may, as legal entities, protect their property rights by recourse to due process of law. They may possess endowments for the benefit of these activities and receive bequests. They may have seminaries wherein their clergy are trained and educated. Over and above all this, property owned by them, when used for purposes of worship, charity, or education, almost universally with us is specially exempt from taxation, not only because it is recognized as of utility to the public welfare, but also in order to carry into effect the spirit of the national will which, expressing itself through the Continental Congress, says: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." (Northwest Ordinance, art. 3.) In this connection the words of our first President are eloquent: "And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." (Farewell address.)

This condition has obtained since the formation of the Republic. It has worked out for the benefit of the state and of the people. No one now seriously believes that it could be changed. It has become an accepted and highly esteemed part of our national life, because it recognizes the rights of conscience, encourages private initiative in the establishing of useful agencies for learning and charity, promotes peace, contentment, and good will among citizens, encourages the enforcement of wise and good laws as well as the practice of civic virtues, and allows to religious freedom in its own sphere for its teachings and for the cultivation of the spiritual life of the people. It has stood the test of nearly one and a half centuries, and the American people to-day are undoubtedly more than ever convinced of the desirability of its continuance. While with us there is no union of church and state, nevertheless there is full and frank recognition of the utility of religion to good government. Hence the American state encourages religion to make greater and greater contributions to the happiness of the people, the stability of government, and the reign of order.

MEXICO'S ATTEMPT TO DESTROY RELIGION

In contrast with this, according to the present constitution of Mexico, no religious society may enjoy the right of corporate legal existence. (Constitution of 1917, art. 130. Law of November 25, 1926, art. 5.) Officially, there are no churches in Mexico, for the church can not possess anything, lacks the right of petition for redress of grievances, can not sue or be sued in the civil courts, and, in general, is entirely without legal standing. Clergymen are disfranchised by the fact of ordination. (Constitution, 1917, art. 37, sec. III.) A church can not own the buildings in which its public worship is held. (Constitution, 1917, art. 27. Law of November 25, 1926, art. 6.) It can not possess endowments. (Constitution, 1917, art. 27, sec. II. Law of June 21, 1926, art. 21. Law of November 25, 1926, art. 6.) It can not take up a collection or a subscription outside the doors of the building used for religious services. That building, however, is owned by the Government, though paid for and supported by the people. The Government merely allows the rightful owner to use it at the good pleasure of State officials. (Constitution, 1917, art. 27, sec. II. Law of June 21, 1926, art. 22.) All churches in Mexico, therefore, have to be supported by collections during the services. Now churches are mainly supported everywhere by subscriptions accepted apart from the acts of worship themselves. With us nearly all church building is paid for in that way. That is forbidden in Mexico, not by a mere regulation, but by constitutional enactment. (Constitution, 1917, art. 130. Law of November 25, 1926, art. 14.)

In order to make this enactment effective, a church is not allowed to possess houses for its bishops, priests, ministers, teachers, or superintendents. Its future may not be provided for, because it can not have a seminary in which a clergy may be trained to take places made vacant by death or incapacity. The fact that a church uses a building is considered good ground for holding that it really belongs to that religious body. It may then be seized and confiscated. If a clergyman even rents a home for himself, the law provides that it may be seized on mere suspicion. Relatives of clergymen are threatened with the loss of their own personal property by confiscation on the ground that such property really belongs to a church, for the law decrees that mere suspicion in such a case is full ground for the presumption that the property is held for the church. (Const. 1917, Art. 27, § II.) All property devoted by religious bodies to educational or charitable purposes is subject to confiscation. (Const. 1917, Art. 27, § III. Law of June 21, 1926, Art. 4.) In order to make it impossible for a church to secure a building of any kind, it is provided that, in case of seizure, no trial by jury shall be allowed should its real owner appeal for justice. (Law of Nov. 25, 1926. Const. 1917, Art. 130.)

WORKS OF EDUCATION AND CHARITY DESTROYED

A church, therefore, can not own anything, can not provide for its current expenses, can not provide for a future clergy. A native clergy is thus made impossible, a fact which ordinarily would throw the burden of the religious care of the people upon strangers. To prevent the possibility of that happening, however, the law provides (Law of June 21, 1926, Art. 1. Law of Nov. 25, 1926, Art. 8. Const. 1917, Art. 130) that no clergyman but a native-born Mexican may officiate in any act of worship; and in consequence foreign clergy have been expelled. Thus the law first makes it impossible for the people to have a native clergy and then impossible to have a foreign clergy; while the Government keeps assuring the world of its liberality and that there is no religious persecution in Mexico. (Foreign Affairs for October, 1926. "The Policies of Mexico To-day" by Plutarco Elias Calles, p. 4. "In conclusion, I wish to lay stress upon the fact that a real religious problem does not exist in Mexico. I mean that there is no such thing as persecution of a religious character against religious creeds or opposition on the part of the Government to the dogmas or practices of any religion.")

The effect of such laws is felt in more than the spiritual work of the church. It is also the ruin of works of education and charity. Religion fosters education. Practically all the great universities of the United States, for example, were founded by religious organizations, except the State universities, and even some of these owe their beginnings to clergymen or to religious bodies, while all owe to them the inspiration that gave them birth. It would be true to say that not one-third of the colleges and universities of the United States would be in existence to-day had it not been for the educational activity of the churches. Almost every American-born statesman and scholar up to 1840 was educated in schools established under religious auspices. Now the Mexican constitution provides (Const. 1917, Art. 3. Law of June 21, 1926, Art. 4) that no clergyman may teach in a primary school, or manage higher schools except on conditions impossible for him to accept. No college under private control may give a degree recognized by the state. (Const. 1917, Art. 130. Law of Nov. 25, 1926, Art. 15. Law of June 21, 1926, Art. 4.) All religious teaching orders have been suppressed (Const. 1917, Art. 5. Law of June 21, 1926, Art. 6) and the formation of such orders made illegal.

Sadder still is the effect of such laws on works of charity, a special field for religious efforts. Churches have always been, and still are, the principal sources of relief for the sick and the poor. More than 60 per cent of the hospital beds in the United States are in religious institutions. To make it certain that churches will not engage in such corporal works of mercy, the Mexican law confiscates institutions of charity and forbids the existence of any religious band of self-sacrificing men and women devoted to their service. In consequence, Mexico is to-day full of ruined institutions of charity, and its sick and poor are without protectors.

Again, under the Mexican law the religious press is permitted to exist only on condition of giving up its liberty. The laws and even the acts of public officials can not be criticized by a religious paper under severe penalties, not even by secular papers betraying a religious bias. (Const. 1917, Art. 130. Law of June 21, 1926, Art. 13. Law of Nov. 25, 1926, Art. 16.) Several religious papers have already been suppressed, and even certain daily papers of large circulation that were not religious but were at least sympathetic with religion. How far such laws depart from the American ideal is shown by the Virginia Bill of Rights and other similar acts.

THE PERSECUTION A PRODUCT OF NEW PAGANISM

It is scarcely necessary to set down the conclusions that naturally flow from the contrast we have made. They are at once apparent and must convince right-thinking men and women that there can be no relationship between the principles upon which the Mexican constitution is built, the laws that embody them, the spirit with which it is proposed they shall be enforced, and the principles, laws, and spirit that are held sacred by the American people.

In fact, such laws hark back to paganism. Were they to prevail they would show civil society to have been marching, not in advance, but in a circle, and again arriving, in this our day, at the point from which it started with the dawn of Christianity. Such laws in reality embody the pagan plan of government, for they differ from it not at all in effect but only in the manner and form of attaining the result. The ancient pagan gave despotic authority to the state by deifying it in its origin and often in its rulers and its actions. The founders of Rome were supposed to be children of the gods. Her emperors were saluted as "divine" and altars erected to them. Great men of Greece were honored likewise. Even to this day some earthly rulers receive quasi-divine honors. The legendary benefactor of the ancient tribes at Mexico and Central America is said to have been a white man worshipped as a god. (Orozco y Berra, Hist. Ant., v. 1, pp. 63-67.) Thus paganism united earthly and divine power in a deified state. The program of this new paganism eliminates the divine so as to leave the earthly in full possession. But the result of both extremes is the same—the slavery of the individual. How far all this is from our convictions as Americans and Christians is immediately apparent.

PART II

WHAT THE CHURCH HAS DONE FOR MEXICO

A cause that has to be defended before the American people by concealing its underlying motives will not hesitate at having recourse to falsehoods and even to suppressing facts of history. Hence it is no surprise to find charges unproved and unprovable urged against the part played by Catholic missionaries in the task of planting religion and civilization in Mexico. This is all the more easily done because the great majority of the people who read and hear such charges have neither the time nor the leisure to give further attention to them, and therefore accept them as undisputed statements of historic facts. In consequence, it is believed by some, and the belief has been encouraged by propaganda efforts of the Mexican Government, especially in our colleges, that these missionaries destroyed a superior civilization in Mexico to build on its ruins a national monument to ignorance and superstition. The popular mind has been fed with the falsehood that the church not only gave nothing of value to the Mexican people, but planted amongst them what was harmful—refusing to improve their condition by establishing schools and meriting their hatred for thus keeping them illiterate and backward for centuries.

THE CHURCH AND THE MEXICAN INDIAN

Fair and honest consideration of the facts will show the frail foundation upon which such charges are built. There was once, in all probability, a pagan civilization in Mexico superior to the social and political condition of any other part of this hemisphere at the time, possibly excepting Peru, but it had disappeared long before the missionaries set foot on Mexican soil. Its depths we can not probe. What the missionaries found, however, was not the fantastic empire of the Aztecs, a creation of the imagination (José María Luis Mora, *México y sus Revoluciones*, Paris, 1836, v. 4, p. 2, et seq. Mora explains that the aid of the masses for the revolt could not be enlisted with abstract ideas about independence, so it was necessary to inflame their passions with "fables" about the greatness of the Aztecs and the "barbarity" of the conquest and "three hundred years of slavery." Hidalgo's rallying cry was defense of kings and religion. Alaman, v. 1, p. 379), but a degraded land in which murder and cannibalism (Cortés, Third Letter to Charles V. Dead are devoured after battle. Bodies of roasted children found in provisions of enemy. Las Casas. *Brevísima Relación*. Dead and prisoners are devoured after battle. Sahagún. Lib. II, Caps. II, XX, XXI, XXII. Durán. Cap. LXXXI. Mendieta. Lib. II, Cap. XVI. Motolinia. Caps. 17, 19, 27. Pomar. *Relación*, p. 17. *Recopilación de Indias*. 1-1-7. (Law forbidding cannibalism.)) had reached the dignity of religious rites. The old civilization, long since passed, had left part of its story preserved in legends and in ruins. The new civilization brought by the Spanish missionaries has its monuments still standing and its deeds set down in historic writings. Its Laws of the Indies have been pronounced the most just code ever made for the protection of an aboriginal people. (Lummis, *Awakening of a Nation*, Introduction.) If we contrast the condition of the Mexican Indian at the beginning of the nineteenth century with that of his northern neighbor we see at a glance that the work of the Catholic missionaries was well done. We find even that the work has not failed to show results down to our own day. The praises and honors showered on Juárez, for example, are not undeserved so far as his intelligence and ability are concerned, but these praises and honors are reflected back to the church that he persecuted, the church that had made a Juárez possible.

Such an Indian as Juárez would be a wonder here, but he was no wonder in Mexico where great men came out of the Indian population, and are still coming out of it, because the church, before her work was hampered and injured, had laid the foundation. Miguel de Cabrera was Mexico's greatest painter, but an Indian. Panduro and Velazquez were worthy of a place in the same hall of Indian fame. Altamirano was at once a great orator, novelist, poet, and journalist, but likewise an Indian. Juan Esteban, a simple lay brother of the Society of Jesus, was so great as a primary teacher that families of Spain sent children across the ocean to secure for them the foundation of this Indian's original and most effective methods of instruction. Among orators, an Indian bishop, Nicolás del Puerto, holds a place of distinction. In the realms of profound philosophy, the world has produced few greater than Archbishop Munguía, of Michoacán. Francisco Pascual García was a great lawyer; Ignacio Ramírez, a distinguished journalist; Rodríguez Gavan, a fine poet as well as a journalist; Bartolomé de Alba, a winning and solid preacher; Diego Adriano and Agustín de la Fuente were expert printers; Adriano de Tlatelolco, a latinist as well. All these were Indians, as were the historians Itztlilxochitl and Valeriano. Rincón wrote the best grammar in the Aztec tongue. He was, like De Alba, himself a descendant of the Kings of Texcoco. A bibliography of the books written by Mexicans before the first revolution fills many large volumes and in it the Indian has no small place. To whom the credit? To the church which the Mexican Government informs the world gave nothing to its country.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS UNDER THE CHURCH IN MEXICO

Baron Von Humboldt testified thus of the Mexico he visited: "No city of the new continent, without even excepting those of the United

States, can display such great and solid scientific establishments as the capital of Mexico." (Political Essay on the Kingdom of New Spain. Translated from the original French by John Black, New York, 1811. v. 1, p. 159. "The capital and several other cities have scientific establishments which will bear a comparison with those of Europe," p. 139.) Why, then, did Mexico advance to such a high place from the depths of savagery, there stop and begin to retrograde, while the United States went on and climbed to her present eminence? Ask that question of the closed university, the suppressed colleges, the empty schools, the confiscated monasteries and convents, students scattered in other lands, the muzzled press, the laws of reform, the sword, the gun, the violated ballot box. One of these alone might have the power only to whisper the answer, but together they shout it so that the whole world may hear. It is an eloquent testimony to the wonderful work of the persecuted church that to her, and to her alone, the credit is due that at the beginning of the nineteenth century Mexico had proportionally more colleges and more students in them, as well as less illiteracy than even Great Britain, a testimony given her by a writer in a recent number of a London magazine. (The Month, October, 1926, "Church and State in Mexico.")

That fine picture fades and is replaced by one of sadness when more than a century ago Mexico's internal troubles began. In two generations she had lost what three centuries of peace and cultivation had won for her; her churches seized; her wealth, formerly dedicated to education and social welfare, turned over to the looter. The worst elements rose to power, and for them power was merely the road to riches. The subversive Jacobin doctrines, an evil legacy carried like a taint in the blood from generation to generation, yet prevail; but the buildings of the church, monuments of education and social betterment, still stand, changed, alas, to other and often ignoble uses. Solidly, often beautifully constructed, many remain as barracks, prisons, hotels, and offices. To Mexico goes the glory of the first book, the first printing press, the first school, the first college, and the first university in the New World. (Icazbalceta. *Bibliografía Mexicana del Siglo XVI*, p. xvi. First printing press, 1536. First book, *La Escala Espiritual*, 1537. First School, 1522. (Justo Sierra, Mexico—Its Social Evolution, p. 478.) First college, 1533. (Cuevas, *Historia de la Iglesia Mexicana*, v. 1, p. 386.) First university, 1553. (Cayo, *Tres Siglos*, Lib. IV, 12.) And to Mexico's Catholic missionaries should go her gratitude for these distinctions. To the evil philosophy of the Red Terror goes only the sad credit for a century of destruction. A French writer on social science said that "Private initiative begins where the intervention of power ends." In Mexico it is proposed never to permit it to begin since the power of the state is to have no end. Yet the state owes all its progress and success to the individual. All advance in education, for example, such as the science of pedagogy, the planning of methods, the proper division of studies, the balanced curriculum, are the contributions of individuals. Surely these neo-Jacobins must see the force of the words of a French writer who said of people under such a régime, that they "judged liberty to lie in restricting the liberty of others."

THE WEALTH OF THE CHURCH IN MEXICO

The charge that the church accumulated an undue proportion of the land of Mexico and gathered to herself vast estates as well as money, on examination has been found to be a gross exaggeration. When the facts are examined in the cold light of history, and the actual figures are given to show of what this wealth consisted, the charge falls to the ground, for the so-called wealth of the church was chiefly in the endowments of Mexican education and works of social welfare. Little land was owned by the church (Humboldt. *Political Essay on the Kingdom of New Spain*. New York, 1811, v. 1, p. 174. "The lands of the Mexican clergy (bienes raíces) do not exceed the value of 12 or 15 millions of francs." (\$2,285,714.28 to \$2,857,152.85.) *Colección Dávalos*, v. 2, Doc. 361. Abad y Queipo says: "Mas: la poca propiedad de la iglesia y clero de América no consiste en posesiones." And in Doc. 363. "El valor de los bienes de estos piadosos destinos (capellanías y obras pías) se puede estimar prudencialmente en dos y medio ó tres millones de pesos." Mora (*Obras Sueltas*, v. 1, p. 372), quotes a report made by the minister for ecclesiastical affairs, 1833, showing 129 farms and 3,331 city properties belonging to the religious orders of both sexes. The total income from these properties is given respectively as \$147,047 and \$631,762. The members of these orders according to that same report numbered 3,160. Mora's estimate of church wealth (minus its fictitious values) totals less than \$120,000,000. Duarte, *Curiosidades Históricas*, p. 82, lists 861 farms and 22,649 city properties valued at \$184,614,000. Various colleges and hospitals, even the Guild of Silversmiths, appear as owners. (See also note 41)), and in part only did even the wealth gathered for the endowments of education and social welfare come from the gifts of the people during a period covering three centuries in one of the richest countries in the world; for these endowments represented also the labor and self-sacrifice of thousands of religious men and women, working for nothing but their bread and raiment. The greater part of the wealth was, as we have stated, not that of the church but of the country's educational and charitable agencies, and the amount itself has been greatly exaggerated for the purposes of propaganda.

When figures revealing the actual extent of these endowments are shown, and when they are contrasted with like endowments for educational and social welfare institutions here in the United States, it is plain that the charge that they constituted an undue part of the wealth of Mexico is not well founded. Three American universities^a alone have endowments greater than all the educational and charitable institutions under the care of the religious orders of Mexico. A certain single non-Catholic religious denomination here, and that not the largest, has far more invested funds than the Catholic Church in Mexico possessed, with all her works of education and charity, at the period of her greatest prosperity.^b That particular denomination in this country to-day has twenty times the number of clergy, in proportion to its membership, and five times the number of church buildings. (This is based on the present population of Mexico, 14,234,799 (census 1921; World Almanac, 1926) and the present number of priests, which is about 4,000.) Moreover, the history of the rise and development of educational and social welfare endowments here is almost identical with those in Mexico, at least in so far as religious motives entered into the effort. The whole foundation of popular and higher education in the United States was built by the religious denominations that had found a place in American life, as we already pointed out; so that if we took from American life all the educational and social welfare values that these pioneers put in it, we would have to-day less than half our present equipment. But here in the United States zeal began and encouragement builded; while Mexico's "patriots" destroyed and ate up her own substance and sold her birthright as, one by one, her schools were closed, her teachers driven out, and her welfare institutions turned over to other uses. Many of these were sold at nominal prices to enrich the families of the revolutionists. (Monjardín, Ocurso, etc., Mexico; Murguía Imprenta; 1862. This is an account of a lawsuit in which it is shown that a certain citizen purchased 50 confiscated properties, valued at \$525,528 (in 1859 at \$587,419), for \$1,832.40 in cash, and government due bills that had cost him \$40,077.90. Romero, Mexico and the United States, p. 363. "The church property . . . was sold . . . at a nominal price, payable partially in national bonds then selling at . . . about 5 per cent of their face value.") Those that stand to-day are monuments to a zeal and devotion that promised great things for the Mexican people, but which is now fast becoming a memory of a light that once astonished by its brilliancy and power; for the early progress of Mexico under the care of its missionaries was the admiration of the world. But figures speak louder than words. The highest estimate of the wealth of the church in Mexico ever offered even by her enemies was \$250,000,000, including all the endowments. Without such educational and social welfare endowments, the property devoted to religion in the United States is estimated by the Federal Trade Commission at \$2,820,220,000. With the endowments, it is estimated at \$7,000,000,000. Proportionately the Mexican figure might well be one-fourth of the American. It was actually not even one-tenth. When it was confiscated the Government realized far less than half of its estimated

^a World Almanac, 1926, p. 392:

Harvard	\$69,689,840
Columbia	57,456,803
Chicago	31,992,620

Total 159,139,263

One hundred and sixty-five institutions possess \$794,231,462 in endowments of \$1,000,000 or more.

^b The Baptists are referred to for purposes of comparison, because the number of their communicants in 1916 happens nearly to equal the number of Mexicans in 1810. The comparison is as follows:

	Baptists ¹	Mexicans
Population	6,107,686	16,122,354
Churches	51,248	10,112
Clergy	36,926	17,341
Unproductive property	\$173,705,809	\$52,331,894
Productive property	\$98,453,844	\$64,073,180
Income	\$43,055,007	\$5,682,153
Total values	\$272,159,654	\$116,405,074

¹ Baptist Year Book, 1916.

² 1810—Navarro y Noriega. Memoria, in Boletín de la Soc. de G. y E. 2a Ep., v. 1 p. 281. Based on census of 1793, and Humboldt, 1803.

³ Romero, Mexico and the U. S., p. 67.

⁴ Mora, Obras Sueltas, v. 1, p. 372. Citing report of minister for ecclesiastical affairs, 1833, including 213 conventual establishments, valued at \$21,300,000.

⁵ Ibid. less his fictitious values; for example: Doctor Mora assumes \$600 as the income of each parish priest, multiplies this by 20, and charges the product to capital.

⁶ Ibid. less his fictitious values, and includes the tithes for 1829, amounting to \$2,341,152. Does not include alms or fees.

⁷ Ibid. less his fictitious values.

Including his fictitious values, Mora's figures show \$181,116,754 total values and \$7,456,593 total income.

According to Abad y Queipo the funds held in trust by the secular and regular clergy (1867) totaled \$44,500,000. Representación. Colección Davalos, v. 2, Doc. 263. Mora estimates them to amount to \$80,000,000. México y sus Revoluciones, v. 1, p. 121. But in his Obras Sueltas, v. 1, p. 372, he follows Bishop Abad y Queipo (\$44,500,000).

These funds were known as "capellanías y obras pías." Their disposition is indicated by \$256,000 of "capellanías" and \$220,630 of "obras pías" being listed with the funds belonging to the girls' college of San Ignacio in Mexico City. Boletín, etc., 2a Epoca, v. 5, p. 652.

value. (In April, 1866, the office reported a total of \$62,365,516.41 of confiscated values. Boletín de la Sociedad de Geografía y Estadística, 2a Epoca, v. 2, p. 388.)

The history of the decline of education in Mexico begins with the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767. Shortly after came the debacle that has been going on ever since. There were few to take the place of the old teachers. College after college had to be given up, most of them closed by the predecessors of President Calles. Gomez Farias closed the University of Mexico, the first university on this continent, in 1833. Reopened by Catholics, it was closed again by Comonfort in 1857. Again reopened one year later, Juarez closed it in 1861. The Liberal cabinet of the weak Maximilian put an end to it in 1865. Later it descended to about the grade of a high school and, with some exceptions in certain departments, it has scarcely more than that rank to-day.

THE CHURCH AND THE POOR IN MEXICO

Bitter indeed was the lot of the people who had to witness, not only the confiscation of the educational and charitable foundations that were their own in every sense of the word, but to see, in the sweeping away of their endowments, the rise of usury and the exploitation of poverty in order to increase the wealth of a new moneyed class that revolution had made. The endowments of the church institutions were almost exclusively invested in the development of Mexico's great agricultural resources at low rates of interest. The revenues from these investments went to the support of the country's educational and charitable institutions, the schools, the colleges, the orphan asylums, the homes for the aged, and the hospitals. The investments themselves increased agricultural and industrial prosperity, even as the returns furthered intellectual and social progress. The very profession of the churchman made of his debtors his friends. But let an enemy tell the tale. We take it from a speech on the subject by Juan A. Mateos in the Mexican Chamber of Deputies, delivered on October 20, 1893. "In the days of the old régime, when the clergy possessed a great number of city and country properties, year after year went by without the shameful evictions to which so many families are the victims to-day. The sordid avarice of the landlords of to-day has no compassion in contrast to the clergy who, animated by a spirit truly Christian, overlooked and excused. The church loaned its capital at a low rate of interest, 4 per cent, 5 per cent, or 6 per cent, which was called the legal rate, a rate unknown to-day. Very rarely was a foreclosure notice published against a property pledged for a loan from these funds. For this reason I proposed, at the time of their confiscation, that a bank for the poor be established from the millions of the clergy, but my voice was drowned in the passions of the revolution. Because of this the selfish interests and exactions of to-day have left homeless the many families who formerly enjoyed the tolerance and charity of the clergy." It was the revolutionary leader, President Juarez, who repealed the laws against usury by his decree of March 15, 1861. The work done for the people by this use of endowments practically constituted a land bank for the Mexican agriculturalists. (Mora, México y sus Revoluciones, v. 1, p. 121. Ramos Arizpe. In Boletín de la Soc. de G. y E. Primera Ep., v. 1, p. 137. José Guadalupe Romero. Boletín de la Soc. de G. y E. Segunda Ep., v. 3, p. 556. Matias Romero, Mexico and the U. S., p. 96. Bustamante, Suplemento a Los Tres Siglos de Mexico, sec. 63.) Only a few years ago our own Government had to found such a bank in the United States for the relief of the farmers.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL UPLIFT IN MEXICO

The charge has been made that the church in Mexico had no definite program of social action, that her attitude has been one of opposition. The record of Catholic Spain in this respect toward Mexico was such as to justify the statement by a recognized authority on the history of the Mexican people that: "No other nation has founded so extensively such beneficences in the colonies." (Lummis, The Awakening of a Nation.) The church was the first organization in Mexico to devote herself to the solving of the social question. But for 60 and more years she has not been free; yet, even before the revolution of 1910-11 broke out, she had already a program of social action, progressive, advanced, and comprehensive, free of the spirit of caste, and not leading to turbulence and to unjust confiscation. This program of the church was one of loyalty to the people of Mexico, generous, disinterested, and inspired by no political passion.

As early as 1903 Catholic delegates in the National Congress of Mexico introduced bills providing for the creation of rural cooperative banks. That year a Mexican Catholic convention was held in the city of Puebla, and, among other problems, it discussed those of labor unions, of the Indians, and of industrial education. Similar congresses were held in succeeding years. In that of 1906 no less than 29 reports were presented covering distinct phases of social action in which the church was at that time engaged in Mexico. At the congress held in 1909, in the city of Oaxaca, practically the entire time of the congress was devoted to the discussion of the Indian problem. (Policy of the Catholic Church in Mexico, 1925, p. 3.)

It was a group of Catholic delegates to the Congress of Mexico that introduced bills giving legal status to labor unions, providing for

Sunday rest, and a workmen's compensation act. In the State of Jalisco, where in 1912 the Catholic members constituted a majority in the State legislature, statutes were enacted protecting the property rights of wives and children, protecting the rights of minorities, and granting a legal status to labor syndicates. One needs but read Catholic publications of that time to know with what zeal the Catholic people and the Catholic clergy of Mexico were devoting themselves to social questions in that country when their action was free. In March, 1913, the National Catholic Party, assembled in Guadalajara, discussed a program which included such points as municipal autonomy, the land problems, rural cooperative banks, and the property rights of wives and children, the mere enumeration of which shows how far not only the party, but the Catholic people of Mexico had advanced in the solution of the social problems of that day. The Catholic labor unions of Mexico, at their convention held in 1913 in the city of Zamora, adopted resolutions demanding every just thing contained in article 123 of the constitution of Queretaro and even went further than this article in the protection of workingmen's rights. (Policy of the Catholic Church in Mexico, 1925, pp. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.)

It would not be hard but for limitations of space to enlarge on the story of the effort of the church along social lines to better the condition of the people, and, at the same time, to insist that the Catholics of Mexico have never failed to contribute their best to all the demands made on them for intelligent, patriotic action.

THE CHURCH AND POLITICS IN MEXICO

The charge that comes easiest to the tongue or pen of the Mexican politician is that the church interfered in politics. The answer is even easier to give than the charge was to make, for no one ever tries to offer proofs that it is true. It is taken for granted that it will be believed without proofs. When and how was the Mexican church in politics? If the charge refers to Spanish times, it is true that men like Bishop Las Casas, to whose memory revolutionary Mexico has recently erected a public monument, were in "politics" to the extent of fighting the Spanish officials in the colony, even to the foot of the throne of the King, to secure justice and education for the Indian. It is true also to the extent that, because of a none too ideal union of church and state in those times, the latter often went beyond its rights granted under the concordat, to encroach upon those of the church, and was for that rebuked and opposed. It is true again to the extent that individuals sometimes sought to use the union for their own self-aggrandizement. It is true in no other way.

If the charge refers to the early revolutionary times, it is true to the extent that priests led the fight against Spain, but that the church condemned them for deserting their spiritual activities to mix in the only kind of politics men then understood—warfare. (One hundred and fifty-five clergymen are listed in *Através de los Siglos*, v. 3, p. 775, as taking an active part in the revolution of 1810-1821. Hidalgo and his followers were condemned in proclamation issued by Bishop elect of Michoacan, Abad y Queipo, September 24, 1810. *Colección Dávalos*, v. 2, Doc. 44.) It is true to the extent that the bishops tried to preserve religious rights against the assaults of the revolutionists of the day. It is true in no other way.

If the charge refers to more recent revolutionary history, it is true that the church is the only defender the country could find against assaults by communists and atheists on civil, political, and religious liberties. It is not true that the church engaged in merely partisan politics. The Catholic Party of Madero's day was a party of laymen organized to win for Mexico by constitutional means a more just and equitable code of laws. Madero welcomed it as "the first fruits of my revolution." To this extent, and not to any other, Catholics, not the church, were in politics. What of it? Does not the democratic state proclaim the legitimacy of constitutional methods to redress grievances? If that method is wrong, then we Americans do not understand democracy. And if these grievances, by the deed of the enemies of religion, lie in the realm of religious rights, are the friends of religion forbidden by that fact to work for their redress, because by so doing they would be mixing in politics?

THE CHURCH AND STATE IN MEXICO

The statement of the Government of Mexico that it is now only trying to dissolve a union between church and state, and that the church is seeking temporal power, finds an obvious answer in the history of the Mexican Nation. There has been no union of church and State in Mexico since 1857. Even before that, however, when in 1821, a revolutionary Mexican Government desired to retain some part of the union in the ancient right of "patronage," formerly enjoyed by the Spanish Crown, so as to have the appointment of bishops in its hands, it was met with a refusal from the Archbishop of Mexico. When the demand was made the following year it was again rejected, this time by the whole body of the episcopate. (Concilio III Mexicano, p. 569. Succeeding governments attempted to arrange for, or to assert, the right to appoint the bishops and priests, until in 1857, when the constitution declared the separation of church and State, and the policy of expropriation was adopted.)

The constitution of 1857 declared the union of church and state to be dissolved. (Art. 3.) That instrument, however, recognized the

church as a legal, though separate, entity. According to the "liberal" doctrine, then in vogue, no "legal person" was such by its own inherent right, and became so only by grant of the State, which by a legal fiction created it. What the State makes, however, it can unmake, and this the constitution of 1917, by a logical conclusion from a false premise, attempted to do. It recognizes (Art. 130) "no juridical personality in the religious institutions known as churches," thus depriving them of any legal protection against the encroachments of tyrants, whose real and often-expressed purpose in Mexico was, and is, not to separate the church from the state, but to subject the church to the control of the state. (Law of Nov. 25, 1926, art. 1.) The church in Mexico, on the other hand, is not asking for the union of church and state to be restored, but for the American system of freedom of religion to be introduced. This may easily be learned from the words (September 7, 1926) of the Mexican bishops addressed to the legislature: "What is it that we petition? Not tolerance, not complacency, much less privileges or favors. We demand liberty and we demand nothing but liberty; we demand liberty for all religions. * * * A régime of restrictions against religion is the denial of liberty."

SLANDERS AGAINST THE CLERGY IN MEXICO

Equal in falsehood with the slander against the church in reference to education and wealth is that concerning extortion on the part of the Mexican clergy. The Indians were exempt from the payment of the tithing during the colonial period. (Alaman, v. 1, p. 23.) On the other classes only the tithing and first fruits were obligatory; anything else being voluntary. (Concilio III Mexicano Lib. III, Tit. XII, sec. III.) The fees which the parish priests were permitted to receive were fixed; those accepting more were fined double the excess. Marriages in the parish church occasioned no offering. The customary offering for baptism was 1 peso. Burials, 5 to 12 pesos. For Indians the customary offerings were one-half those expected from the Spaniards. (Arancel, 1767.) Those who have seen the poverty in which the clergy of our generation have lived need no proof drawn from statistics to know that they have been slandered. It suffices to say for those of other days that the total offerings collected in the churches by the Mexican clergy never represented a donation of even as much as 1 peso from each member of the flock per year. Offerings on the occasions of baptisms and marriages are smaller than those made to clergymen in the United States. (The Churchman, a Protestant Episcopal publication, in an editorial February 6, 1915, quoted William Watson (a non-Catholic, who had lived some eight years in Puebla, Oaxaca, Guadalajara, and Mexico) on offerings as follows: Baptisms, 33 to 69 cents; marriages, \$2.50 to \$3; and nothing for baptisms and marriages during missions.) Works of education and charity have been supported chiefly by those whose means enabled them to be generous, as in our own country. The poor paid nothing but the copper dropped into a collection basket on Sunday. In Spanish times it is quite true that the revenues of the bishops were often large. Humboldt (Political Essay on the Kingdom of New Spain, New York, 1811, v. 1, p. 173) gives the revenues of the bishops as follows: Mexico, 130,000 double piastres (evidently pesos or dollars); Puebla, 110,000; Valladolid, 100,000; Guadalajara, 90,000; Durango, 35,000; Monterey, 30,000; Yucatan, 20,000; Oaxaca, 18,000; and Sonora, 6,000. The last was from the government treasury. The tithing for the 20-year period 1771-1789 averaged \$1,584,048.90 per year according to a tabulation given by Humboldt (Political Essay on the Kingdom of New Spain, 1822 edition, v. 3, p. 96). The tithing was divided as follows: One-fourth to the bishop, one-fourth to the cathedral chapter; the remaining half was divided into nine parts, of which two-ninths went to the King, three-ninths to the cathedral building fund and hospital, and four-ninths to the parish priests. (Recopilación de Indias, Lib. I, Tit. XVI, Ley XXIII.) It is also quite true to say that the surplus was spent on the great institutions to which we have already referred.

Indeed, the building of hospitals and orphanages seems to have been the favorite work of many bishops, who paid for them out of the revenues not needed for the support of their households and the cost of managing their large dioceses. (It was customary for the bishops to devote any surplus to works of public benefit. This accounts for the numerous schools and hospitals founded by them. The San Andres Hospital is an example. It was founded in 1779 by Archbishop Haro, who secured the building, which had been a Jesuit college, from the Government. He equipped it with 400 beds, all endowed. By February, 1790, his donations had totaled \$459,586. The hospital's funds amounted to \$1,454,657. Some of the properties belonging to it appear in the list of the confiscated properties referred to in note 40.) The hospitals in particular were the best that the times knew and superior to those of Europe. Some of those still standing are considered models for such a climate as that of Mexico, even at this day. Notable among such wonderful buildings is one in Guadalajara, which is still visited by physicians, even from the United States, to study its construction and its plans for the care of patients; yet it is three centuries old and the gift of a bishop. Where the revenue of Bishop Zumárraga went is indicated by one of his letters (Zumárraga, Estudio Biográfico.

García Icazbalceta, p. 215) to the King of Spain written in 1537: "That which occupies my thoughts, to which my will is most inclined and my small forces strive, is that in this city and in every diocese there shall be a college for Indian boys learning grammar at least, and a great establishment with room for a large number of the daughters of the Indians." Before his death the Bishop had seen to it that a goodly part of his wish was made a reality. Nor should we pass without attention the letter of Geronimo Lopez to the King in which, as early as 1541, he complained against the church because her clergy had taught the Indians too faithfully, even to the point of making them excellent writers and expert latinists. (Colección de Documentos para la Historia de México. García Icazbalceta, v. 1, p. 148.)

It must be remembered that the bishops were the responsible trustees of funds for works other than those of the parishes and missions. In their zeal for progress, however, they often went far afield to make Mexico a progressive nation, for we find them building public roads and even aqueducts. (Aqueduct at Durango, 1728. Gaceta of April, 1728. Aqueduct at Valladolid (Morelia) 1788. Bol., etc., 3a. Ep. v. 1, p. 627.) If the poor of Mexico have been systematically robbed by the extortion of their clergy, surely it will be hard to explain a devotion on their part to the church and to their pastors which not even rigid censorship succeeds in concealing from those who to-day read what is happening in Mexico.

THE CHURCH TURNS TO PRAYER, NOT ARMS

Even Catholics have asked why the church in Mexico does not use its undoubted power to bring this persecution to a speedy end and take measures to prevent its recurrence, since it is admitted that the overwhelming majority of the Mexican people are of its fold. They forget that there are but two human means to that end—the ballot and the sword. The first is hopeless in Mexico, because there the ballot is not respected and governments are unaffected by it. Few citizens use it, because their votes are counted only when they favor the ruling powers or when these powers, for effect or deception, are willing to admit the existence of a small minority. An outstanding proof of this is found in the rejection, by a vote of every member save one, of the petition for relief addressed by the Mexican bishops to the Congress, though the petition was supported by the people. Congress, Senate, and courts do the bidding of the President; and this condition has been the rule and not the exception since "liberty" came to Mexico by force of arms. It will continue to be the rule while that kind of "liberty" stays. Ballots are less powerful than bullets when they are the playthings of tyranny.

The second human remedy is equally hopeless, for Christian principles forbid the church founded by the Prince of Peace to take up the sword or rely upon such carnal weapons as the inflamed passions of men would select. If the church has learned many things in her life of 2,000 years, the principal lesson came from the patience of her Divine Founder. She is not fated to die, but she has learned how to suffer. With Him she will be crucified, but with Him also she will rise. The weapons of men are not for her. But, if these human weapons the church will not use, she has one that well fits her hand, armored as it is in justice and in truth. She has prayer. Never in the history of the trials of the church in Mexico has that weapon been so firmly held as now, thanks to the paternal counsels of the sovereign pontiff. Because of these, no longer does the quivering voice of the afflicted church of Mexico rise alone to the Comforter. From end to end of the earth the answer to the appeal of Pius goes upward to the throne of God. The hatred of men may spurn it. The malice of men may curse it. The unbelief of men may mock it. But its hope is in a promise and its power is in a faith.

THIS IS NO APPEAL FOR POLITICAL INTERVENTION OR ACTION OF ANY SORT

What, therefore, we have written is no call on the faithful here or elsewhere to purely human action. It is no interposition of our influence either as bishops or as citizens to reach those who possess political power anywhere on earth, and least of all in our own country, to the end that they should intervene with armed force in the internal affairs of Mexico for the protection of the church. Our duty is done when, by telling the story, defending the truth, and emphasizing the principles, we sound a warning to Christian civilization that its foundations are again being attacked and undermined. For the rest, God will bring His will to pass in His own good time and in His own good way. Mexico will be saved for her mission, whatever it may be. That this mission is now to give a great example of Christian patience and to demonstrate the force of faith undaunted, we may well believe. For the future we may take confidence from the examples of other nations that went through the same fiery furnace of persecution and emerged, triumphantly prepared for great things. The Mexican nation once proved its inherent worth by its rapid advancement in Christian civilization. For the days of De Gante and Zumárraga, Las Casas, and Motolinia, as well as those of Junipero Serra, who carried the work of the missionaries into what is now our own land, Mexico has no need to offer apology.

MEXICO'S DEBT TO THE CHURCH

For the sad days of decline, the church, forbidden by law to teach and robbed of the means to carry on her mission of enlightenment, has

only to show her chains, and say to her enemies: "You blame me for poverty, yet you took from me the endowments for my hospitals, my orphanages, my countless works of mercy. You blame me for ignorance, yet you closed my schools and stole my colleges, the first to light the torch of learning on this continent. You say that I have added nothing to science and art, but you destroyed the art I brought with me and developed, burned my books, and scattered the results of my labor for science to the four winds of Heaven. You blame me for lawlessness, yet you destroyed my missions among a peaceful and thriving Indian population, and gave to them, in place of Christ's Gospel, the 30 pieces of silver with which you bribed them to murder their fellows. You took the cross out of their hands to replace it with a torch and a gun. Show me one good thing in Mexico I did not give you. Show me one genius for whom I was not responsible. Show me one step toward the light that I did not help you to make. Take out of your country all that I put in it and see what remains. You may thrust me out, exile my bishops, murder my priests, again steal my schools, and desecrate my sanctuaries, but you can not blot out history, you can not erase the mark I made on you—not in a century of centuries."

"FOR MY NAME'S SAKE"

If the gaining of the whole world does not recompense the individual for the loss of his soul, what, then, shall it profit a nation? There was a soul in Mexico, a spirit manifesting its presence by the impulse that sent her missionaries of civilization along a way unmarked save for the print of their sandals, but now the great royal road of California—the Camino Real. It was a spirit that, building on its faith and its inspiration, left monuments to tell Mexico's story in the old missions of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and along the shores of the Pacific from San Diego to San Francisco. For us of the north, these buildings, landmarks of the first Christian missions within our borders, beacons of the light of religion and civilization on our soil, fountains and fertile sources of a distinctive literature touched and tinted with colors and values all its own are treasures honored as a rich legacy, noble and ennobling. The old records speak in the Spanish tongue to tell us that it was not really Spain but Mexico that sent the padres to the north. Their Castilian speech is passing; nor are there left many descendants of the brave souls who came with them to write the first chapter, the chapter of beauty, into the history of our California. But the memories are not dead, nor has the trail been lost, that was marked by the discoverers who gave to the far western country the first martyrs as well as the first teachers in all our Nation. Through them we share in the glory of the initial gesture of Christian civilization on this continent. We have not denied, nor shall we deny, our debt to Mexico for this. Already it has been acknowledged by voices which, if they do not all sing the old hymns, yet do all understand something of the message of the singers; if they do not all worship at the old altars, yet do all hold sacred the spots upon which the padres built them, and give to the new cities that grew around them the old names, to keep for the great West its traditions, its character, and its charm. If the mother should forget what the sons and daughters love, shall not these sons and daughters take shame instead of glory from her? For you of our own flock in this happy land, where the rights of conscience are recognized and upheld by the laws and respected by the people, we reecho the appeal of our holy father, Pope Pius XI, and ask the charity of your prayers—a memento in the daily masses of the priests, and a remembrance in the daily devotions of the faithful—for your afflicted brethren in Mexico, recalling to you words of our Lord to show that your practical sympathy thus expressed will be pleasing in His sight: "Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice sake, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven." (Matthew v, 10.)

To the bishops, the clergy, and the faithful of Mexico we inscribe this defense of their history and their rights, not alone as a duty to the faith we hold in common, but as a testimony to their fortitude under trial and to the justice they preach in their dignified and legitimate demands. We bid them be of good cheer, for to Mexico in affliction may the significant words of the Master to the apostle of the Gentiles be once more applied: "This man is to Me a vessel of election, to carry My name before the Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel. For I will show him how great things he must suffer for My name's sake." (Acts ix, 15-16.)

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the head of the Knights of Columbus, Mr. James A. Flaherty, issued a statement, which was carried in the newspapers this morning, advertising to the remarks of the Senator, of which I have made mention. I ask that Mr. Flaherty's statement may be incorporated in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. Mr. HEFLIN. Let us have it read.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to have it read?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not desire that that be done, but I will be glad to have it read for the information of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. If it is going to be printed, I should like to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATEMENT OF JAMES A. FLAHERTY, SUPREME KNIGHT OF KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, ON SENATOR HEFLIN'S CHARGES

The accusation that the Knights of Columbus in their 1926 convention pledged themselves to propaganda to force the United States into war with Mexico is utterly unfounded and unjust.

We have heretofore paid slight attention to incredible nonsense of this sort, for it has come only from professional disturbers who have devoted themselves anywhere and always, regardless of justice or truth, to attacking the Knights of Columbus. But when these accusations are made by men who have voice in the affairs of the Nation, the time for the kindness of silence is past. We will not stand by quietly and be slandered.

The Knights of Columbus have not urged war with Mexico and do not want war with Mexico. Our resolution, adopted at our supreme convention in 1926, clearly declares the object of our work. I quote from it, as it stands in our official records and as it was given to the public press the day of its adoption: "We hereby authorize our supreme board of directors to assess our membership to the extent of \$1,000,000 for a campaign of education, to the end that the politics of Soviet Russia shall be eliminated from the philosophy of American life, and the ideals of liberty of conscience and democratic freedom may extend to our afflicted fellow human beings beyond the Rio Grande."

THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS DO NOT URGE INTERVENTION IN MEXICO

The Knights of Columbus do not plead for United States help for the Catholic Church in Mexico. The Knights of Columbus know that the attack on the Catholic Church in Mexico is an attack on religion and religious freedom. They know that the present rulers of Mexico, apostles of Bolshevism, are seeking not merely to destroy the Catholic Church, but to destroy all religion and to establish communism in Mexico and in the western world.

The Knights of Columbus hence recognize Mexico as a grave problem. They have tried to bring this grave problem more immediately to the attention of the people of the United States. They have not presumed at any time to propose a solution of the problem. They trust in the ability of the Government of the United States to find that.

The Knights of Columbus have protested against the persecution in Mexico, not in the name of the Catholic Church but in the name of humanity and liberty. They have raised their voice against this persecution even as they would raise their voice against any similar persecution wherever it might be and against whomever it might be. They have repeatedly stated their stand. If protesting against injustice and military barbarism is not the privilege of American citizens, whose privilege is it? And if this protesting is "propaganda," then let our critics make the most of it.

The Knights of Columbus have repeatedly declared that they do not seek intervention in Mexico. I quote from *Columbia*, their official organ, of October, 1926:

"The Knights of Columbus do not ask the Government of the United States to intervene in behalf of the Catholic Church in Mexico. They know that the church in Mexico will survive and endure unimpaired the experience it is undergoing, if and so long as Mexican Catholics reveal the moral fiber of resistance. The Knights of Columbus asked merely—and asked with full right—that the Government cease from all forms of intervention in Mexico in behalf of the Mexican enemies of religion, political freedom, private property, and, ultimately, of the United States."

The issue is not the Catholic Church. The issue is religious and political freedom. Those who are against such freedom will approve of the present Government of Mexico. Those who believe in such freedom will do their share, honorably and openly, as we have tried to do, to guard it and to make its preciousness realized and the perils to it known.

The Knights of Columbus say of their work, as said the Catholic bishops of the United States of their pastoral, that it is aimed in no way "to reach those who possess political power anywhere on earth, and least of all in our own country, to the end that they should intervene with armed force in the internal affairs of Mexico for the protection of the church. Our duty is done when, by telling the story, defending the truth, and emphasizing the principles, we sound a warning to Christian civilization that its foundations are again being attacked and undermined."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, not only have the Catholic bishops of the United States expressed themselves in the manner indicated in the pastoral letter but the Catholic bishops of Mexico have declared themselves upon the same subject. The Associated Press of August 11 carried a report of resolutions adopted by them, a copy of which unfortunately I have not at my command at the present time; but in that the Catholic bishops of Mexico stated that in the event of an attack upon Mexico by a foreign power they would take the

lead in the patriotic defense of their country. Accordingly, Mr. President, if war with Mexico should ensue—and I regard the thing as practically chimerical; God forbid that it should—the responsibility of the thing must be laid at the doors of some one other than the Catholic Church of the United States.

Mr. GILLET obtained the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. GILLET. For what purpose?

Mr. HEFLIN. How long is the Senator going to speak?

Mr. GILLET. I do not think I shall take long.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I shall have to rise to a question of personal privilege, then, at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator from Montana has submitted for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an attack upon me by the head of the supreme council of the Knights of Columbus. This man Flaherty, from Connecticut, chief official of the Knights of Columbus in the United States, said in his statement, read at the clerk's desk, that my position on public questions was taken without regard to the justice of the proposition or the truth involved. The author of that statement is a cowardly and brazen falsifier. His statement is an unqualified falsehood and he knew that it was a falsehood when he made it.

My speech on yesterday was based on the resolution passed by the Knights of Columbus at Philadelphia in August, 1926. The resolution speaks for itself. I quoted from it yesterday and will quote from it again to-day.

I have before me a copy of the New York Times of August 6, 1926, and the date line giving a report to the New York Times as to what happened at Philadelphia is August 5. In large letters in the headline the New York Times said that the Knights of Columbus raised a million dollars "to press the issue." Now, what was the issue? They were discussing the Mexican situation. The resolution was about the Mexican situation. The resolution complained about the attitude of the United States Government toward Mexico. The resolution demanded intervention. Let me read from the resolution itself:

The period of watchful waiting or any other such procedure is over. We, as American citizens, demand of our Government that this action be taken forthwith.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] did not read that. This is not a request made to the President to make a thorough investigation of conditions in Mexico, but it is a straight out demand upon the President of the United States by the Knights of Columbus to abandon the course which has kept peace between the United States and Mexico, and proceed at once to use force against the Mexican Government. That meant war, and every honest person in the country knows it.

Mr. President, here is another remarkable statement in the resolution of the Knights of Columbus:

Therefore as a pledge of our concern for our fellow Knights of Columbus of Mexico, and of our determination to pursue relentlessly our campaign for the eradication of these evils at our own doorsteps—

Referring to Mexico, of course—listen to this, Senators—

fomented and approved by the official action of our State Department, we hereby authorize our supreme court of directors to assess our members to the extent of a million dollars—

Mr. GILLET. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will state his point of order.

Mr. GILLET. I do not mean to be at all discourteous, but it does not seem to me that the Senator is discussing a point of order. I should like to ask him how long he is going to occupy the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN. Not over 5 or 10 minutes. I am discussing a question of privilege. The Senator is mistaken; I am not discussing a point of order. I am discussing a question of the highest privilege, too. Plunging this country into war with a foreign country is a matter of the highest concern.

Here is a part of the resolution where the Knights of Columbus are pledging the aid of 800,000 knights to aid their brother Knights of Columbus in Mexico. They are raising a million dollars to carry on war propaganda here, and they are bitterly arraigning the Government of the United States for its refusal to do the bidding of the Knights of Columbus to go to war with Mexico. Is not that what the resolution means? If not, what do they mean by this language in the Knights of Columbus resolution:

The period of watchful waiting or any other such procedure is over. We, as American citizens, demand of our Government that this action be taken forthwith.

Mr. President, it is not pleasant to have to go into these things and lay bare such reprehensible and un-American doings as this resolution discloses, but somebody has got to do it if the country is to know the truth. I do not care whether it is a Protestant organization or a Catholic organization; I do not intend to sit silent and permit any interests to plunge my country into war without entering my protest and giving the truth as I see it to the people of the United States. When I am doing that I am doing what every Protestant and Catholic should approve.

I saw in the Post yesterday morning the earmarks of approaching war, an inspired article from Mexico telling of the atrocious things being done over there. This is propaganda sent out to inflame the American mind. They had the statement, in big headlines, that the tongues of five little boys were cut out. I do not believe a word of it. They are getting up and getting out war propaganda just as sure as I stand here to-day. I shall not be surprised to see some outbreak pulled off soon in Nicaragua where an American soldier is shot.

Mr. President, I was in this city last August when the Knights of Columbus in convention at Philadelphia passed this resolution. Let me read some more of what they said:

We particularly call upon the American Federation of Labor and its affiliated organizations to heed this appeal to cooperate with us to safeguard not only American rights but the hard-won victories of labor itself, to protect it from servile submission to destructive powers of a militaristic and communistic form of government.

And the Washington Post this morning, one of their mouth-pieces, has a big cartoon on the editorial page—the Federation of Labor, a stalwart, husky fellow, kicking communism out of Mexico.

Why, Mr. President, we would be stupid indeed if we could read this resolution and then not see that they are seeking intervention—war—with Mexico. A man would be dull indeed who could not see that these forces have been doing everything in their power to drive us into war with Mexico.

As I said a moment ago, it is unpleasant to have to bring out these things. I am not making any attack on anybody's church. I am opposed to allowing anybody's church and everybody's church plunging my country into war; and I want to know what the average American of average intelligence and of unquestioned loyalty will think when he reads about the Knights of Columbus in the United States pledging their aid to the Knights of Columbus of Mexico, and at the same time denouncing our Government for its course, and raising money for the purpose of involving us in war. What do they mean by that? Is there something more sacred and above allegiance to the Government of the United States? Is the tie that binds them to the Knights of Columbus of Mexico stronger than the tie that binds them to their country? Why is it that they strike their country a body blow with one hand in that resolution and at the same time extend the other hand into a foreign country, giving assurances of aid and support to the Knights of Columbus over there?

We might just as well be frank about this matter. The country is going to know the truth, so far as I am able to convey that truth. I do not propose to sit silent here while certain interests are trying to drive us into war with Mexico. I am going to speak out in my place as a Senator, even if I incur the displeasure of the head of the Knights of Columbus. I believe in free speech and in a free press. Let them criticize my position here as elsewhere.

Since I commenced this fight in August they have already said nearly every mean thing about me that they can say. In my efforts to prevent war I care nothing for the criticism of those who want war. I know I have offended them. I would love to have the good will of every man and woman in the United States. I love people, and I love to stay in a good humor; I love to laugh, and I like to tell stories and hear them told; but the Bible says there is a time for all things. There is a time to laugh, and there is a time to be serious. There is a time to work, and a time for refraining from work. But the time for me to discharge my duty to my country is every day during the time that I have been selected to serve in this body.

Mr. President, I recall, in 1914, when a little war cloud in the Old World was seen above the horizon, and nobody thought very much about it. I saw that cloud grow. I saw it expand. I saw it spread until its black wings covered the earth, and I saw 10,000,000 young men murdered in the shadow of those black wings. I saw half the wealth of the world consumed on the altars of war.

Nobody will do more to defend that flag and its honor than I will; but I am not ready to have it employed as a banner of the Knights of Columbus on an expedition to carry aid

and comfort to their brother Knights of Columbus in a foreign country.

The President of Mexico, as I understand it, is trying to separate church and State in Mexico.

This country ought to be the very last one upon the earth to lift its hand and draw its sword against a country imitating it in the separation, complete and absolute separation, of church and State.

This resolution speaks for itself. I read it in August, and I was shocked and astounded. I gave out a statement then, and that is when this wrath arose against me amongst the Knights of Columbus. That is when they perhaps determined that they would preach a crusade against me through the columns of the sheets they control. But what is a loyal American Senator to do? If he is an upstanding American, and worthy to sit here, what is he to do—fold his arms and seal his lips and permit his country to be used to further the cause of sinister interests or fraternal or church interests? I do not care whose church it is, whether it is a Protestant Church or a Catholic Church. I will not be their tool in such an hour.

God forbid that the day shall ever come when an American Senator fears to lift his voice in this place and speak the truth against the Catholic Church or a Protestant Church when they do things against the best interests of the country.

I am not in favor of permitting these or any other influences to go to work and drag my country into war. The propaganda that started in this resolution is being spilled out every day around here by the advocates of war with Nicaragua. That is not what they are after. Let us tell the truth about it. Mexico is the object in view. War with Mexico is what they want. Why not let the country know the truth? If we go to war the day will come when they will have to know. The day will come when they will bid their boys good-bye at the gate and see them march off to a foreign battle field to fight, and maybe to die.

Why not tell the truth about it? Should I refrain from doing so because I feared that some king bee of the Knight of Columbus would become offended, that he would write a little piece denouncing me? I know he is offended. He would be offended with you, Senators, if you dare to put yourselves in the way of this war program.

I am willing to put my Americanism up against that of any Member in this body. I want to be fair and just to everybody. I am giving to the Senate and to the country the truth as I find it in this resolution. It tells what was done.

Let me read a little more of that. I was interrupted by the Senator from Massachusetts just as I had gotten to where they raised a million dollars for a campaign of education.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. "To the end that the politics"—

Mr. GILLETT. The Senator said he would take 5 or 10 minutes, and I courteously yielded. He has already talked 15 minutes since then.

Mr. HEFLIN. Every time the Senator gets up he inspires me to go again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will have to rule that the Senator from Alabama is not now addressing himself to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HEFLIN. What is the reason I am not, Mr. President? When I am reading the very basis for the speech I made on yesterday, for which I have been denounced by the highest officer of the Knights of Columbus, why am I not speaking to a question of privilege? Why can not a Senator rise and speak, if an article like that is read, rather than permit other Senators, in the routine of debate, to occupy the time and keep him from speaking? Mr. President, it is certainly a matter that I am entitled to discuss. It involves the very question that I raised.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President, the Senator certainly can not take me off the floor to discuss it. I yielded to him on his statement that he would take 5 or 10 minutes. He has taken 15 minutes, and I claim the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I will not speak over five more minutes, if the Senator will permit.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. I demand the regular order. The ruling of the Chair has been that a Senator can not be taken off the floor on a point of personal privilege.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Senator is going to raise that question, I make the point that I was on my feet, and addressed the Chair twice before the Senator from Massachusetts did, and I demand my right to claim the floor. The Vice President looked at me and then looked over there and recognized the Senator from Massachusetts. So I make that point. The rule provides

that if a Senator rises and addresses the Chair, the Presiding Officer must recognize him. The Senator from Montana had finished his speech, and then a Republican Senator, who doubtless did not want me to discuss this question, arose, and the Chair looked at me, and then, smiling kindly in that direction, recognized the Senator from Massachusetts. So, if Senators are going into those questions, I will go into them, too.

Mr. MOSES. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HEFLIN. Because I promise that the country shall know the truth about what happened.

Mr. MOSES. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MOSES. Has the Senator from Alabama appealed from the ruling of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama has not yet appealed. I understood the Senator from Kansas to demand the regular order. Is the Chair correct?

Mr. CURTIS. I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Petitions and memorials are in order.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I give notice that later on I will address the Senate on this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no petitions or memorials, reports of committees are in order.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President, I wish to express briefly my views on the Nicaraguan question.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I shall have to demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President, I start, in considering the relations of the United States with Nicaragua, with the premise that we, a great, strong country, in all our relations with that small and weak country ought to consider not only our own interests, but we ought equally to consider the interests of Nicaragua.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HEFLIN. I rise to a point of order. If I am not to be permitted to finish reading the resolution of the Knights of Columbus disclosing their efforts to get us into war with Mexico, I shall demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 5059) for the further protection of fish in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1251) thereon.

Mr. SACKETT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 4727) to provide for the widening of Nichols Avenue between Good Hope Road and S Street SE., in the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1252) thereon.

Mr. NORBECK, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11601) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and so forth, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1253) thereon.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15959) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1255) thereon.

Mr. JONES of Washington. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 3896) to amend section 11 of the merchant marine act, 1920, and to complete the construction loan fund authorized by that section, and I submit a report (No. 1254) thereon. I should like the attention of Senators to this bill because I hope that in the near future we shall be able to have it passed by unanimous consent. It is an important matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

CODIFICATION OF NAVIGATION LAWS

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a codification of the navigation laws of the United States. It is not a petition, simply a codification of existing

law. This has been ordered favorably reported by the Commerce Committee, and I am going to have placed on the desks of Senators the committee print of the report on the bill in the hope that that will satisfy Senators with reference to it, so that I can probably have this bill passed by unanimous consent on Monday.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 5295) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to execute agreements of indemnity to the Union Trust Co., Providence, R. I., and the National Bank of Commerce, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 5296) granting a pension to Sylva J. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 5297) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Swartz (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 5298) to amend the tariff act of 1922 by placing wheat for seed purposes during the season of 1927 on the free list; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 5299) for the relief of Sam H. Allen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 5300) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Newell;

A bill (S. 5301) granting an increase of pension to Dora Erickson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5302) to pension soldiers who were in the military service of the United States during the Indian wars and disturbances and the widows of such soldiers, and to increase the pensions of Indian war survivors and widows who are now pensioned; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 5303) granting a pension to James A. Partain; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5304) granting an increase of pension to Miguel Archuleta; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico:

A bill (S. 5305) granting a pension to Sarah E. Boothe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL:

A bill (S. 5306) for the relief of the partnership of McCarthy & Sturm; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ERNST:

A bill (S. 5307) to amend section 215 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 5308) granting a pension to Effie Viola Meranda (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) providing for the continued ownership and operation of United States merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. GOODING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the deficiency appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1927, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill to insert:

For the extension of the irrigation system over an area of 9,670 acres within the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project between Fort Hall and Gibson, \$145,000.

Mr. GOODING also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for surveys and investigations to determine the feasibility and cost of irrigating the Michaud division and other lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, and for the protection of water rights on the Blackfoot River, and the preparation of plans and estimates for the improvement of the Blackfoot River channel to enable conservation of the waters of said river, including determination of damage done to land-owners adjacent thereto, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the deficiency appropriation bill for 1927, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS

The first bill on the calendar was the bill (S. 2607) for the purpose of more effectively meeting the obligations of the existing migratory-bird treaty with Great Britain by the establishment of migratory-bird refuges to furnish in perpetuity homes for migratory birds, the provision of funds for establishing such areas, and the furnishing of adequate protection of migra-

tory birds, for the establishment of public shooting grounds to preserve the American system of free shooting, and for other purposes.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator has five minutes under the rule.

Mr. GILLETT. I shall wait until I can get more time.

THE RADIO LEGISLATION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] about a purported interview with him on the radio bill. I read from this morning's Washington Herald:

President Coolidge, during the conference, manifested his continued opposition to the Dill bill, passed by the Senate, which establishes an independent board for radio control.

He believes that it is high time for the Government to stop organizing new boards which are independent of the President, of the Cabinet, and of the other executive branches of the Government. The Secretary of Commerce can be trusted to perform the executive and routine functions of regulation, he believes. He seemed convinced that the White bill creates a board judicial in character, which could be expected to protect rights of the public and of broadcasting agencies.

President Coolidge made much progress in a conference held by him with Senator DILL late yesterday. When leaving the White House, Senator DILL said:

"Mr. WHITE and I have agreed upon a compromise bill. In principle, it confers the administrative powers of radio regulation upon the Secretary of Commerce and establishes a quasijudicial board to which appeals can be taken. Unless the other conferees tip it over, the bill probably will be successful in this session of Congress."

I am very much interested in the radio bill, and I want to ask the Senator from Washington if that is the nature of the agreement to which the conferees have come.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, the quotation attributed to me in the news item which the Senator has read is not a correct quotation. I did state to the reporter that Mr. WHITE, as a member of the subcommittee of the House, and myself, had reached certain tentative agreements on a bill which would divide the powers between a commission and the Secretary of Commerce, but I did not at any time say that that commission would be an appeal body. I do not want to accuse the reporter of intentionally misquoting me, but that is a complete misstatement of the situation, because whatever agreement has been made up to this time provides nothing of the kind. There is no agreement at all for an appeal commission, but the tentative agreement as made provides that the commission shall have certain powers, very largely of a judicial nature, and that the Department of Commerce shall have certain powers in administering the decisions of the commission, and carrying out the orders and regulations of the commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then the tentative agreement does not put the power of absolute control in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. DILL. It does not, and at no time has such a proposal even been seriously considered by the conferees. This tentative plan represents substantial concessions by both sides to the controversy. It is a compromise that takes away some of the powers of the commission under the Senate bill and gives those powers to the Secretary of Commerce; but the powers of the commission and the Secretary of Commerce do not conflict. Rather, the powers and duties of the one might be said to dovetail into the duties and powers of the other.

Mr. McKELLAR. Can the Senator tell us when we shall probably get a report on the subject?

Mr. DILL. One of the House conferees has been ill, and Mr. WHITE wanted to take back the proposal for further consideration among the House conferees. I am hoping we can have a conference of the full body of conferees early in the week.

I may say to the Senator that the differences between the House and Senate have been so wide that we have had a great deal of difficulty in getting satisfactory language that will divide the powers as is planned by this compromise measure. I am extremely glad to make it clear that at no time has it been intended to have a mere appeal board. It will probably mean that the commission will not be required to sit all of the time or to be engaged in the performance of its duties at all times, but such powers as the commission will have will be powers that will be retained and exercised by the commission as a separate and independent body, so far as the Secretary of Commerce is concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. And will be real powers?

Mr. DILL. Yes; they will be real powers.

Mr. McKELLAR. And not advisory powers?

Mr. DILL. They will be supreme powers on those subjects to which they relate.

Mr. McKELLAR. My purpose in asking the question of the Senator is the fact that I daily receive very many communications, from my State especially, in regard to what will probably be done and when. Of course, the Senator understands there is the greatest interest being taken in the matter and I hope very sincerely that the conference committee will get together.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I may say in my own time that the conferees recognize the great demand and the great need for radio legislation, and because of that we have made concessions on both sides. We have worked a great many hours over the matter, and up to this time our meetings have all been harmonious and have all tended toward the desired result, namely, a bill upon which we hope finally to agree and which will be satisfactory to both Houses and the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DILL. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand it, the commission will be retained for the purpose of control, and the administrative work of the commission will be carried on under the administration of the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. DILL. That is the tentative plan.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a few days ago, when I inquired of the Senator from Washington with reference to when the conferees would agree, the Senator stated he thought they would agree the latter part of this week. Will the Senator indicate when he now thinks the conferees will agree?

Mr. DILL. Of course, the Senator must recognize that any man who deals with the subject in the situation which now exists must be an optimist if he does not quit altogether. I have probably been unduly optimistic in my opinion that we would reach an agreement at an early date. The fact that we have continually made progress leads me to be optimistic still that we will reach an agreement. Certain things arise which are unexpected. Members of the conference suggest certain things which cause discussion and possibly delay. One member of the conference has been sick. As the Senator knows, delay is the easiest thing in the world to bring about in a matter of this kind. I have hopes now of a definite result next week, because we can not get any results this week, of course.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I want to suggest to the Senator that unless something is done very quickly some Members of the Senate will have to ask for an additional appropriation for extra clerical hire to take care of their mail.

Mr. DILL. I recognize that fact.

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 2607 is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

IMPORTATION OF MILK AND CREAM

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, House bill 11768.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11768) to regulate the importation of milk and cream into the United States for the purpose of promoting the dairy interests of the United States and protecting the public health.

THE NICARAGUAN SITUATION

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President, for the fourth time, thanks to the courtesy of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], I will state that I start with the premise that in our relations with South America the United States, a great and strong country, when dealing with a small and weak country, ought to consider not only its own advantage and the rights of its own citizens, but ought equally to consider the rights of the small country and its citizens. I believe that the conduct of the State Department in the recent crisis in Nicaragua absolutely conforms to that standard. I think we considered the interests of Nicaragua as much as we did the interests of the United States.

I am not familiar with the previous history of our relations with Nicaragua. I was not then in a position to know the inside facts. But I am familiar with President Taft. I believe he has as high morality, personal and political and international, as anyone, and I am confident that he would have scorned any attempt to overreach Nicaragua, but would consult

her interests as much as our own. I think the same is true of President Wilson, though my acquaintance with him was only formal and official.

The crisis which we are now discussing arose after the election in Nicaragua of 1924, when Solorzano and Sacasa were elected as President and Vice President. I think in considering conditions there that it is well to remember that Nicaragua has a population of 500,000 or 600,000 people, about the same as the city of Washington, mostly Indians, negroes, and mixed blood, with a small percentage of Spaniards who are generally the leaders. They are largely farmers and workers on banana plantations or in mines and lumber camps.

Our marines at the time of the election of 1924 had been there for many years, and, although the guard was slight—only about 100—yet I presume that the long peace was in some measure due to their presence.

At any rate, during that time conditions in Nicaragua had enormously improved. When we went in there was political turbulence and the financial condition was desperate. There was a very large external debt and the revenues were precarious. By 1924 the currency, which had been almost worthless, had been reestablished and was at par. Their debt had been greatly reduced. The bank and the railroad had come into the hands of Nicaraguans, and there had been an era of quiet and order and prosperity. During that time—I think it generally will be admitted—there was no favoritism exercised by the United States toward our citizens there. There is no claim, I think, of any concessions or exploitation or monopolies by United States citizens, but while there were many of them there in business they simply shared the prosperity of the whole country.

In 1924, as I said, there was an election, and on the 1st of January, 1925, the new officers took control. At their request the Marines, instead of being immediately withdrawn as had been expected, stayed on some months. But at last, in August, they were withdrawn. Within two months of their withdrawal a successful revolution broke out. We had hoped that this long period of peace and prosperity would in some measure have overcome the tendency of Nicaragua toward revolution.

And there was another influence which we had hoped would work toward the same end. In 1923, in Washington, under the auspices of the United States, a treaty was entered into between the five Central American nations which provided that in case of a successful revolution in any of those countries, none of the other nations would recognize the chiefs or leaders of the revolution as President. It was hoped that with the prospect of recognition taken away the inducement to revolution would be lessened. But neither expectation was realized.

General Chamorro, an able stubborn soldier, who had long been active in Nicaraguan affairs, organized a revolution, captured the citadel with ease, and the whole Government was soon under his control. He compelled the President to resign the Presidency and he left the country. Vice President Sacasa also went out of the country, and General Chamorro assumed the Presidency and the control of the Government and for some months his rule was undisputed. Then a revolution broke out, but he suppressed it. Another revolution, more serious, flared up. In the meantime the United States, apparently to his surprise, had refused to recognize Chamorro, although we were not bound by the treaty, and the other South American Republics did the same, so that he was simply a successful revolutionist recognized by no country as President. After a time, discouraged apparently, he resigned in favor of one of his followers, Uriza, but the United States refused to recognize him also, and he, too, after a short time, apparently was discouraged. Soon after acquiring power Chamorro had driven out some of the members of the parliament who were opposed to him, so that he had a rump parliament subject to his will. After Uriza found that he could not obtain recognition and continue his Presidency, the old members of the parliament, who had been driven out, were recalled. Eighteen had been expelled, and about half of them returned and the full parliament, as authorized by the constitution, elected Diaz as President.

Then arose the vital question, "Shall the United States recognize Diaz?" Only two alternatives are now suggested which we might have adopted. One is that the United States should recognize Sacasa, who was vice president. He went out of the country and it is claimed that thereby the office became vacant. It is also claimed—and I think the argument is full of force—that if he left the country from fear, then the men who drove him out are estopped from setting up the fact of his absence. If he went out under duress, it certainly does not, it seems to me, lie in their mouths to say that he himself by his absence eliminated the possibility of his occupying the Presidency.

The difficulty in that argument is that if Sacasa was expelled by force, so was Solorzano, the President. Nobody supposes that he resigned because he desired to do so. I have no doubt that he resigned under compulsion, under duress. He doubtless left the country, just as did Sacasa, because they both thought, under existing circumstances, some other climate would be more healthy for them than that of Nicaragua. Therefore, if either of them should be recognized, if either of them is entitled to the office, it seems to me it is the President, who has expressed his willingness to come back, rather than the Vice President.

There is one other alternative which has been suggested, and that is that the United States should ignore all claimants to the presidency and should order a new election in Nicaragua.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me for just a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHORTRIDGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator from Massachusetts tell me by what right or under what constitutional provision the United States has a right to order a new election in Nicaragua?

Mr. GILLET. That is just what I am coming to. To recognize Diaz required the United States to exercise no power over Nicaragua, but to call back Solorzano or Sacasa, when the man now holding the office of President was elected by the Congress according to law, would be a failure to recognize an existing government and interfering actively against it. To go in and say that there should be a new election would be for the United States again, openly by force, to obtrude itself into the affairs of Nicaragua and overturn its constitution. I sympathize with the suggestion that a new election might be best for that country. But it can not be done by us under the Constitution. Personally, I should be glad to see Solorzano, for he was duly elected in 1924, back in power, but the question which faced the United States in November last was, shall we recognize Diaz, who is present, and has been elected by the duly constituted Congress, or shall we recognize a President or Vice President who has been out of the country ever since he abdicated?

It seems to me that under those alternatives the United States adopted the wise course and took the action which was best adapted to promote the interest of Nicaragua. The United States simply recognized an existing government. That required the least interference on our part, was furthest from intervention.

The convention between the Central American States provided that the leader of a revolution should not be recognized as President; I am assured that Diaz had no part in the organization of the successful revolution by Chamorro; that he did not participate in that revolution, although after Chamorro had succeeded and taken control, he then did act as an agent of Chamorro.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to inquire of the Senator if he has seen the statement which was issued by Chamorro? After the State Department had failed to recognize him, and he had started for Europe, he issued a statement in which he said, "I can not understand why the United States will recognize Diaz and not recognize me, because Diaz was at all times one of my chief lieutenants," or words to that effect.

Mr. GILLET. That would not be at all conclusive upon me.

Mr. WHEELER. No; but I am asking the Senator if he has seen that statement.

Mr. GILLET. I do not remember to have seen it. Chamorro, however, going away in resentment against the United States for not having recognized him would, of course, be glad to show inconsistency on our part.

Mr. WHEELER. At the time of his departure, let me say, he was leaving under direction of Diaz, who had appointed him to some position.

Mr. GILLET. I do not see how that affects the matter. Chamorro endeavored to secure the recognition of the United States; I suppose he expected to get it. He failed, however, and naturally his feelings toward the United States are not kindly.

So, Mr. President, when that crisis came in November last an extremely difficult and disagreeable problem was presented to the United States for solution. Solorzano had been elected President, but was out of the country. Sacasa, who had been elected Vice President at the same time, was also out of the country; but there was a government, which had been

elected by the Congress of Nicaragua, duly empowered by the constitution.

The United States had no personal ends to serve; we had nothing to gain by favoring one candidate as against another. I believe the United States acted simply for what it thought was the interest of Nicaragua and in that manner which would seem to involve the least suggestion of exercising control over Nicaragua. In doing that the Government of the United States recognized the existing government of Diaz, and he has since been recognized by several other countries in Central America and elsewhere.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GILLET. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Why should the President have recognized Diaz at all, in view of the situation which existed? The President of the country had been driven out. We refused to recognize Lenin and Trotsky, the leaders of the Russian régime which had killed the heads of the previous Government. In this instance in Nicaragua the head of the Government was thrown out, and there is a man in the presidential office there now who the Senator from Idaho says has never been constitutionally elected President.

Mr. GILLET. That is where I differ from the Senator from Idaho. We recognized Diaz because we believed he had been constitutionally elected. He was the official President of Nicaragua; and, as I have said, of the alternatives which were presented to us, this was the one which at that time was best adapted to pacify Nicaragua and required the least show of force by the United States.

What the future will prove we can not tell. The State Department hoped at that time, I understand, that following the recognition of Diaz there would be an immediate collapse of the revolution and a stable, undisputed government; and that probably would have happened except for the arms and finances from Mexico, which kept alive the revolution of Sacasa.

A question was asked in the Senate the other day which struck me as interesting. "Is Nicaragua better off because of the intervention and the occupation by the United States during these years, and do the Nicaraguans themselves think that they are better off?" I can not see how there can be but one answer to that question. Nicaragua flourished amazingly during those years; her previous desperate economic condition was turned into prosperity. Of course, the question always arises as to what is meant by being "better off."

Mr. BORAH. Yes; that is the question.

Mr. GILLET. Some persons may say that Adam in the Garden of Eden, with no cares and leading an easy life, was better off than are any of his descendants to-day; for instance, a Senator of the United States, with the discoveries of science through the ages at his service, and with the most interesting foreign and domestic problems to occupy his time.

Mr. EDGE. Can there be any question about that?

Mr. GILLET. Some may take one position and some the other; and in the same way some may claim that in 1492, when the people of Nicaragua were undisturbed by civilization, they were better off than they are to-day. So it might be claimed that before the United States intervened the Nicaraguans were better off than they are now; but by all our standards and tests of prosperity Nicaragua and her people were far better off when we withdrew our marines in 1924 than they were when we went in. But the significant portion of the question to me was, "Do they think they are better off?" In our relations with the South and Central American Republics, no matter how philanthropic and generous we may be, I doubt if we can expect much of a return of gratitude. There is such a difference in the constitution of the mind and the political trend of the Anglo-Saxon and the Latin races that it is difficult for the latter to comprehend and sympathize with us, and I think it often will happen that our very best directed and most disinterested efforts for their good, instead of being appreciated by them, may perhaps be resented. At the end of the World War it looked as if nearly all the nations would adopt the Anglo-Saxon system of self-government, but to-day two of the most powerful Latin nations have apparently abandoned it and prefer an autocracy. I presume in Latin America difficulties will prevail, so that no matter how hard we may try to be friendly, to be the elder brother, and to bring about close relations of harmony, it is quite likely we will not succeed.

I think our activities in the Philippines constitute the greatest exhibition in the world of the altruism of one nation toward another. For 25 years we have done unselfishly all we could to educate the Filipinos and govern them for their own good; not always wisely, but always with the best intentions, and

yet to-day I suspect that on Luzon, their most advanced island, if the question were put to a vote whether or not they wished a continuance of American assistance, the vote would be overwhelmingly against us. In the same way I am afraid that in our relations with the South American Republics, owing to the different instincts for government of the different races, there will be a failure to secure the harmony which we could wish. Still despite lack of appreciation, we must aim to act for them as we think is for their good.

Of course we must protect our citizens everywhere, and we must also protect the citizens of foreign nations in countries where we will not allow them to come and protect their own citizens. While we protect them, however, we must also guard the interests of the nation where they live; and, in my opinion, we have no right, in our relations with them, to look for our own advantage at their expense.

It seems to me the State Department, in the crisis in Nicaragua in November, acted on that theory. The department had no motive to prefer one candidate to another. All it had in mind was the quiet and peace of Nicaragua; and it chose the course by which the United States would be called upon for the least interference. The department recognized the existing government, and I, for one, trust that the existing government will be able to maintain itself; that our marines, who are there to preserve the security of American citizens, will be called upon to do nothing else; and although I myself am sorry that in 1924 the marines were withdrawn—it looks to me now as if, had we kept that little bodyguard of 100 men there, we might have had peace all this time—yet I hope that they will not be needed in the future. It may be that the inability of Chamorro as a successful revolutionist to obtain recognition may tend to curb revolutions in the future; but the main purpose of my argument has been to show what I believe is the fact, that in November the recognition of Diaz was accorded not because it furthered any interest of the United States, but because it was in strict compliance with the law. I believe it also was to the interest of Nicaragua, and I hope that events will prove that it was a wise determination.

RELATIONS WITH MEXICO

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Record an editorial article from the New York Journal of Commerce of yesterday and two editorial articles from the New York World of to-day upon our relations with Mexico.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of January 14, 1927]

A SERIOUS SITUATION

It is not exaggeration to say that the Secretary of State has "stunned" the American public with his formal memorandum to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Now, 24 hours since that document was placed in the hands of the people, American citizens, by and large, are still in a "stunned" condition. Astonishment, at least among the discerning, however, is not due to any significant revelations contained in the labored words of Mr. Kellogg. Nothing of the sort is to be found there. Such vaporings as those he quotes at great length have been the staple diet of discontented elements almost everywhere since the days of Karl Marx and before. Not even an attempt is made to show that the Mexican Government, upon which attention is largely centered, has in any way identified or associated itself with the "communist" movement said to be so active in Mexico at the present time. What the well informed in this country find it hard to grasp is the fact that the Secretary of State could bring himself to any such utterance, and that, as Washington dispatches assert, should have been able to strengthen his position in any such fashion.

The fact is, however, that he has done so and in the act has converted a serious situation into a very critical one. It is hardly necessary to point out that the words of the President to Congress the other day and now the memorandum of the Secretary of State would, if directed at a first-rate power, be tantamount to war. It is incredible that the authorities at Washington are deliberately attempting to drive Mexico into a war with us, and yet it is as difficult to understand what else is intended, unless it be to create a condition in Mexico that would make it impossible for the existing constitutional régime in Mexico to continue in power. At any rate, whatever may be the intention at Washington, it is hard to see how serious consequences to Mexico, and for that matter to this country, are to be avoided now that both the President and his ranking Cabinet member have spoken as they have. These facts may as well be faced now as later.

Mexico seems to be the storm center of the whole matter at the present moment; but, whether our officials at Washington are or are not fully aware of the fact, Mexico is by no means all that may be

involved before we are through with this affair. Feeling no doubt runs high against us in Mexico, but what is just about as important is the truth that resentment at our domination and a general spirit of irredentism in fairly widespread and apparently steadily growing in all our "concealed" Latin American dominions. Mexican activities of late, the proposed treaty with Panama, and a number of other causes are responsible. That what communists are said by Mr. Kellogg to "term American imperialism" is the real article in the Caribbean and neighboring regions may be taken for granted. That growing discontent with it is solely due to outside interference, whether from Russia or elsewhere, no one with any acquaintance with the facts or whose judgment is worth the proverbial fig believes. This hazard exists none the less, and should we presently find ourselves embroiled with Mexico we should without much question have good reason to know it.

Of course, the question to which the best thought in Washington ought to be directed is: How best to deal with this general Latin American situation that is well known to exist? Is the cure for the evils that have come with domination to be found in more direct and more rigorous suppression? Is the answer to be found in more warships and more marines in Caribbean waters? Possibly; but the great powers are not finding such methods to be very effective in China. France and Spain did not find them profitable in northern Africa. European powers abandoned them some time ago in Turkey. Great Britain, perhaps the shrewdest imperialist of them all, has long since learned that other and more subtle means accomplished desired ends with less cost and far less trouble. We now, as a result of a long series of mistakes, find ourselves in a difficult position. It is not easy for us at this stage to "back down" in Latin America. We should be wise, however, very carefully to count the cost of going ahead blindly before we commit ourselves still further.

Not only should we be inexcusable to send our battalions into Mexico for any causes that have yet been made known to public, not only should we certainly find that such a course would cost a great deal more than it came to, but we are in real hazard of presently finding ourselves on the horns of an unpleasant dilemma, forcing us either to abandon a good deal of economic, if not political, domain in Latin America or else come forward openly as the dominating force in the internal affairs of several small alleged independent nations. The consequences of the former course can easily be seen. The alternative would bring down upon our heads even greater dislike and distrust in South America and a distinct loss of confidence and trust in Europe and elsewhere.

Now is the time for our officials and our citizens to stop to do some careful thinking before it is too late.

[From the New York World of January 15, 1927]

THE ULTIMATE QUESTION

For the first time since he entered the White House the President is involved in a really serious crisis. He has been until recently one of the most fortunate of all our Presidents. He came into office after the greater questions of postwar reconstruction had been decided, and he has been blessed with prosperity at home and tranquillity in our foreign relations. Mr. Coolidge has been able, therefore, to devote his attention to the administrative routine of the Government without having to trouble himself about attempting to formulate any policy of far-reaching significance. He has relied on the judgment of his appointees and has to a very large degree detached himself from the work his own officials were doing. In his own utterances he has dealt with generalities, leaving to others, more or less without firm guidance from him, the making of those little decisions which, in their cumulative result, constitute the real policy of the Government.

There is every reason to suppose that this is how the President came to find himself at the end of December called upon to explain and defend the situation which had been created in Nicaragua by the action of minor officials in the State Department. It is altogether unlikely that the President brought his mind to bear seriously on the events of last November which involved us in the support of Adolfo Diaz and of hostility to Juan Sacasa. The way the official spokesman fumbled one explanation after another, and the unpersuasive character of the message to Congress last Monday, indicate clearly that Mr. Coolidge took a hand in the matter after Mr. Kellogg and his associates had committed him. Mr. Coolidge on Monday was defending Mr. Kellogg's action rather than his own policy, and he had very much the air of a man who had not altogether persuaded himself.

The heart of the danger lies in the fact that Mr. Coolidge has allowed the control of Latin American policy to drift into the hands of small officials who are so involved in the details of their controversy with Mexico and so subject to pressure of all kinds that they no longer see the forest for the trees. But it is the special business of the President to see the forest, to see the larger significance, to realize the far-reaching consequences of a chain of decisions. On specific disputes the officials may be right or they may be wrong. The thing which is decisive in these matters is the direction in which they are going. The alarming and the tragic fact about affairs in Washington to-day is

that the direction in which the State Department is going is toward revolution, intervention, and perhaps war. The crux of the whole matter lies in the fact that the officials immediately in charge have lost patience, have lost faith, have become cynical and reckless. They have decided, and they will remain decided until the President, backed by an overwhelming public opinion, turns their minds in the other direction, that a doom is driving us inevitably toward the use of force.

No one need claim that it is easy to negotiate with Mexico or with the Central American States. In many ways their standards are not our standards, but a statesman is a man who will not let his irritations control his judgment. The problem raised by Mexico is of historic consequence, and in the long run it can be solved only by men who have in their minds a picture of its largest meanings.

The United States dissociated itself deliberately in 1920 from responsibility for the political future of the white race in Europe and asserted that the field of its responsibility lay in the Western Hemisphere. It then asserted that the affairs of this hemisphere could not be the subject of European diplomacy, and that the United States had and would maintain a paramount interest in Latin American affairs. The nature of that interest has, however, never been defined, the will of the Latin peoples has never fully been consulted, and the rights of American action have never been established.

What Mr. Coolidge is called upon to do now is to make clear by the character of his action toward Mexico and Nicaragua just what interests we claim and what rights we assert. He is called upon to define the substance of a general policy, which thus far we have announced only in the vaguest terms. And in doing that he is required to make one of the gravest decisions which an American President can make.

For he is called upon to decide whether the United States will take the imperial view and place itself in fundamental opposition to the national aspirations of the Latin peoples, or whether it will accommodate itself to the growth of their national feeling. This is the problem which Great Britain faces in India, in Egypt, in the old Ottoman Empire; it is the problem which all the powers face in China. The thing which the ignoramuses call Bolshevism in these countries is in its essence nationalism, and the whole world is in ferment with it.

The program of the Calles government in Mexico, both as to the property of foreigners and to the position of the Roman Catholic Church, is identical in inspiration with the long historic process which in Europe goes back to Henry VIII, to Luther, and includes the wars of Italian liberation, the break-up of Austria-Hungary, and the disintegration of the Sultan's power. The inspiration is nationalistic, and Mexico is only the latest and the nearest manifestation of a world-wide phenomenon. We have got to decide as to Mexico whether we shall suppress that nationalism temporarily and by force, or whether we shall recognize that in its main inspiration and its chief purposes, all petty disputes aside, it is an irresistible development to which it is wise for us to adjust ourselves.

The enormous consequences of this decision can not be limited to Mexico. If we take the imperial line and say that Mexico must restore the ancient position of the foreigner and the church, then we shall not have merely Mexico to deal with. The force which is at work in Mexico is latent to some degree everywhere in Latin America. It is not within our power, great as is our power, to stamp it out and to stem the tide of history. Like Britain in her empire, like Japan in hers, our safety and our interest lie in winning peoples whom we can never hope, even if we desired it, permanently to conquer. Yesterday it was Haiti and Santo Domingo, to-day it is Nicaragua and Mexico, to-morrow it may be Venezuela and Peru; once we take the position that we are the guardians of the old régime on this continent, once we assert that the Monroe doctrine is like the doctrine of the Bourbons and the Hapsburgs, we are committed for an indefinite time to the use of force and to the illimitable complications of a reactionary empire.

That was not the purpose of the Monroe doctrine and that is not the true and sober will of the American people to-day. The Monroe doctrine at its inception combined a regard for our own safety with sympathy for nations struggling like our own for political independence. We have nothing to gain and much to lose if we transform that doctrine into one which places us in the rôle of the Holy Alliance, prepared to use our force to deny the right to that national development which a hundred years ago we helped Latin America to win.

[From the New York World of January 15, 1927]

A SHAMEFUL PERFORMANCE

Mr. Kellogg said:

"The significance of Mexico in the eyes of the so-called soviet government is revealed in the following extract from the report of Chicherin, made at the third session of the Union Central Executive Committee in March, 1925."

Thereupon Mr. Kellogg quoted Chicherin's statement that Soviet Russia had established diplomatic relations with the Calles government and so obtained "a political base in the new continent with the neighbor of the United States, Mexico." This was the high spot in Mr. Kellogg's memorandum. But Mr. Kellogg forgot something. He remembered what Chicherin said of Calles. But he forgot what Calles said to Chicherin in reply.

On May 7 following the Chicherin statement in Moscow, Calles warned Chicherin explicitly and formally, as follows:

"The Government of the Mexican Republic will not tolerate any abuse of good faith, seeking to make it an instrument for the realization of maneuvers or combinations of international politics, or for the propagation of principles which we do not uphold."

That is, Calles specifically protested against just that strategy, thought up in Moscow, of which Mr. Kellogg now complains.

Do not believe for a moment that the State Department was unaware of this Calles protest. It knew all about it. On May 9, two days after the Calles protest, the Associated Press reported as follows, in a dispatch from Mexico City:

"The American ambassador, James R. Sheffield, declared at his regular conference with the newspaper men to-day that the relations between Mexico and the United States have been improved by the recent statement of President Calles with respect to a speech by the Russian Soviet Foreign Minister, M. Chicherin, that Mexico would not allow any country with which she maintained diplomatic relations to use this friendship to carry out political propaganda."

Here is Mr. Kellogg's ambassador in Mexico City patting Calles on the back for standing up to Soviet Russia and asserting his country's independence. And we submit that if the Chicherin statement belongs in the record, so does the Calles answer and Sheffield's indorsement of that answer.

Mr. Kellogg did not put these items in the record. He falsified the record. It is not too much to say that if Mr. Kellogg practiced tactics of this sort in a private case in an American law court he would be subject to disbarment.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 3 hours and 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 17, 1927, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 15, 1927

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

To be commander

William T. Stromberg.

To be lieutenant commanders

Henry G. Hemingway.

Jeremiah A. Starr.

Floyd J. Sexton.

Gustavus U. Stewart.

Joseph F. Farley.

Carl H. Abel.

Frank J. Gorman.

Gordon W. MacLane.

Robert Donohue.

Earl G. Rose.

Lloyd V. Kleihorn.

Edward H. Smith.

Elmer F. Stone.

Carl C. von Paulsen.

Fletcher W. Brown.

John E. Whitbeck.

Henry Coyle.

Frederick J. Birkett.

John Trebes, jr.

Lyndon Spencer.

Joseph Greenspun.

Louis W. Perkins.

Raymond T. McElligott.

Robert M. Kaufholz.

Andrew C. Mandeville.

Louis B. Olson.

Roger C. Heimer.

Lester E. Wells.

To be lieutenant commanders (engineering)

Herbert N. Perham.

Benjamin C. Thorn.

Milton R. Daniels.

Ellis Reed-Hill.

Mayson W. Torbet.

Gustavus R. O'Connor.

Walter M. Troll.

Charles T. Henley, jr.

Edward F. Palmer.

John N. Heiner.

To be lieutenants

Albert M. Martinson.

Edward H. Fritzsche.

Carleton T. Smith.

Raymond J. Mauerman.

Robert C. Jewell.

George E. McCabe.

Lee H. Baker.

Donald C. McNeil.

Harley E. Grogan.

William S. Shannon.

Harold G. Belford.

Seth E. Barron.

Charles W. Harwood.

Frederick R. Bailly.

John P. Murray, jr.

Severt A. Olsen.

Robert C. Sarratt.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Thomas Y. Awalt.

Alfred C. Richmond.

Walter R. Richards.

Roy L. Raney.

George B. Gelly.

Russell E. Wood.

Clarence H. Peterson.

James A. Hirshfield.

Joseph D. Conway.

Charles W. Lawson.

Frank T. Kenner.

George C. Carlstedt.

John Roundtree.

William W. Kenner.

Stephen P. Swicegood, jr.

Henry C. Perkins.

Paul W. Collins.

Charles W. Thomas.

Frank A. Leamy.

John H. Byrd.

To be district commanders

James F. Phillips.

Simon R. Sands.

Chester A. Lippincott.

Frank B. Lincoln.

John Kelly.

Martin W. Rasmussen.

Ralph T. Crowley.

Howard Willcox.

James A. Price.

Oswald A. Littlefield.

Eugene T. Osborn.

William M. Wolff.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

To be lieutenant commanders

Richard S. Bulger.

Gerald F. Bogan.

Frank E. Beatty, jr.

To be lieutenants

Lloyd A. Dillon.

Dew W. Eberle.

Stuart H. Ingersoll.

Edgar W. Hampson.

Burns MacDonald, jr.

Joseph B. Seletski.

William A. Gorry.

John W. Harris.

Francis X. McInerney.

William G. Eaton.

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Calvin H. Mann.

To be medical directors

Robert E. Hoyt.

Edgar L. Woods.

James P. Haynes.

To be medical inspectors

Walter A. Bloedorn.

John J. O'Malley.

Luther Sheldon, jr.

Stanley D. Hart.

Richard H. Laning.

Robert G. Davis.

To be surgeon

Benton V. D. Scott.

To be dental surgeon

Arthur H. Yando.

To be pay inspector

Raymond E. Corcoran.

To be chaplain

Albert E. Stone.

To be assistant civil engineer

John R. Perry.

To be chief carpenters

Arthur F. Whittier.

Charles S. Kimbrough.

To be pay director

Henry deF. McI.

MARINE CORPS

BY PROMOTION

To be first lieutenant

James M. McHugh.

To be chief pay clerk

Arthur D. Sisk.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Alice McNamee, Castroville.

Francis C. Harvey, Rivera.

Fred C. Alexander, Yosemite National Park.

FLORIDA

Frank J. Owens, Kelsey City.

Elizabeth D. Barnard, Tampa.

GEORGIA

Albert S. Hardy, Gainesville.

Marcus G. Keown, Mount Berry.

George H. Broome, Pavo.

INDIANA

Earl D. Robison, Attica.
 Charlie E. Smith, Coal City.
 Wade Denney, Farmersburg.
 Arthur E. Dill, Fort Branch.
 Charlie W. Elliott, Middlebury.
 Earl L. Rhodes, Milltown.
 Thomas J. Jackson, New Albany.
 Calvin Ulrey, North Manchester.
 Chester M. Davis, St. Paul.
 James C. Brown, Salem.
 Bert C. Lind, Sandborn.
 Edith A. Wetzler, Sunman.
 Lee Herr, Tell City.
 David E. Purviance, Wabash.
 Isaac Sutton, Waynetown.

KANSAS

Nellie C. Preston, Buffalo.

LOUISIANA

Howard G. Allen, Dubach.
 James A. Gannon, Natchitoches.
 Edward J. Sower, Norwood.

MINNESOTA

Nelse Monson, Belview.
 Bertha Finch, Butterfield.
 William G. Early, Eyota.
 Kenneth S. Keller, Kasson.
 James A. Christenson, Preston.
 Floyd H. McCrory, Rockford.
 Jonas W. Howe, Stewartville.
 Fred F. Campbell, White Bear Lake.

MISSOURI

Benonia F. Hardin, Albany.
 Melvin J. Kelley, Annapolis.
 Louis E. Meyer, Bowling Green.
 John A. Griesel, Golden City.
 William S. Tabler, Jasper.
 Henry O. Abbott, Lebanon.
 Lloyd R. Kirtley, Madison.
 William E. Hodgins, Maitland.
 Theron H. Watters, Marshfield.
 Fred Mitchell, Purdy.
 Charles A. Bryant, Richland.
 Frank A. Stiles, Rockport.
 Elvin L. Renno, St. Charles.
 William H. Roster, St. James.

MONTANA

Edwin Grafton, Billings.
 Franklin R. Whaley, Fairview.
 John O. Dahl, Froid.
 Howard Squires, Harlowton.
 Robert H. Michaels, Miles City.

NEBRASKA

Earl S. Murray, Bloomington.

NEW JERSEY

John Rotherham, Jersey City.

NEW MEXICO

Jeffrey A. Houghton, Magdalena.

NORTH CAROLINA

Mrs. Ezra Wyatt, Hobgood.
 Don H. Gosorn, Old Fort.

OKLAHOMA

Roy Patterson, Capron.
 Lloyd D. Truitt, Helena.
 Nellie E. Vincent, Mutual.
 Jonas R. Cartwright, Shattuck.
 Bertha A. Wolverton, Wapanucka.

PENNSYLVANIA

William T. Cruse, Derry.
 Samuel H. Bubb, McClure.
 Joseph L. Roberts, Sharon.
 Sara B. Coulter, Wampum.
 William A. McMahon, West Pittsburg.

TEXAS

Lock M. Adkins, Beeville.
 Robbie G. Ellis, Fort Davis.

VIRGINIA

Morgan B. Hobbs, Rose Hill.

VERMONT

Frank E. Howe, Bennington.
 John H. Dimond, Manchester Center.
 John T. Tudhope, North Hero.
 Orrin H. Jones, Wilmington.

WASHINGTON

Walter L. Cadman, Dayton.
 Edward Van Dyke, Lake Stevens.
 William R. Cox, Pasco.
 Charles E. Rathbun, Pomeroy.

WEST VIRGINIA

Horatio S. Whetsell, Kingwood.
 Eva Lucas, Tralee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, January 15, 1927

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of our fathers, Thou art under the great burden of the world, and this infinite truth means strength for the weak, love for the loveless, and a rescue for all human life. Our prayer is that we may hear the world's deeper meaning through the surface of mortal things. Lead us so we shall feel most deeply a new power and a new persuasion bursting from the fountain of eternal truth. When the door of this day closes lift us above the work of the week and give us respite from our labors. May home be sweet and loved ones dear; and may we hear the spiritual melody that lures us to a better and a nobler life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WATER POWER

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by having printed some correspondence between my colleague, Hon. CORDELL HULL, and former Senator John K. Shields, touching the subject of water power.

I may say that this has direct bearing upon a bill sponsored by Mr. HULL and myself and introduced by myself a few days ago. The bill is very short, and I should like permission to insert the bill in connection with the correspondence.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing correspondence between his colleague [Mr. HULL] and former Senator Shields with regard to the subject of water power. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, is this on the subject of water power?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes; it has bearing upon a bill sponsored by Mr. HULL and myself and introduced by me a few days ago. The bill is now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following bill and correspondence between Hon. CORDELL HULL and former Senator John K. Shields of Tennessee:

[H. R. 15426, 69th Cong., 2d sess.]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 December 18, 1926.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved June 10, 1920, and for other purposes"

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress, approved June 10, 1920, creating the Federal Water Power Commission, providing for the improvement of navigation, the development of water power, and the use of the public lands in relation thereto, shall not be construed or interpreted to authorize and empower the Federal Power Commission to grant permits or authorize any person or corporation to survey the banks, shores, or soils of nonnavigable streams for the purpose of constructing dams and reservoirs on such streams, otherwise than upon